



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-87-036

CONTENTS

20 OCTOBER 1987

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Ligachev Addresses Conference on Culture [Ye.Ligachev; Moscow Domestic Service, 2 Oct 87]	1
PRAVDA Reports USSR Supreme Court Plenum [PRAVDA, 30 Sep 87]	1
CPSU CC Approves Restructuring of Political Studies [Moscow Domestic Service, 25 Sep 87]	2
PRAVDA Report on Political Studies Resolution [PRAVDA, 26 Sep 87]	2
Grishkyavichus Speaks at Lithuanian CP CC Plenum [P.Grishkyavichus; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 31 Jul 87]	6
Cadre Policy Discussed at Uzbek CP CC Plenum [KOMMUNIST UZBEKISTANA, 6 Jun 87]	14

MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

Journalist on Publishing Different Views [A.Belyayev interview; MOSCOW NEWS, 6 Sep 87]	19
--	----

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Traditional Interpretations of Stalin Era Defended [V. A. Kozlov; VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, May 87]	21
---	----

CULTURE

Artist Glazunov Deplores Resurgent Avant-Garde [I. Glazunov; PRAVDA, 27 Sep 87]	30
---	----

REGIONAL ISSUES

USSR Aide on Pollution Status of Moscow Atmosphere [V.G.Sokolovskiy; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 26 Sep 87]	33
---	----

SOCIAL ISSUES

Oppressed, Tradition-Bound Tajik Women Driven to Suicide [A.Ganelin; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 8 Aug 87]	34
--	----

Ligachev Addresses Conference on Culture
LD031033 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1530 GMT 2 Oct 87

[Text] A conference has been held in the CPSU Central Committee at which progress in the fulfillment of decisions of the CPSU Central Committee and of the USSR Council of Ministers on strengthening the material basis of culture and of creative unions was considered.

Speaking at the conference, Comrade Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted the significant role of culture, literature, art, and journalism in the intellectual life of Soviet society. The creative intelligentsia strives to make a worthy contribution to all spheres of the restructuring which is being undertaken by the party and the people, and it is necessary to constantly provide assistance in improving the conditions of their activity. Where the task has been approached in a responsible and interested way, Comrade Ligachev stressed, the work is undertaken at a good rate.

By way of example, the enterprising attitude with respect to the construction of the concert complex in Vilnius, the reconstruction of the printing works in Tula were cited. However, at many construction projects of creative unions, the rate of construction work leaves much to be desired.

The unsatisfactory attitude to the construction of clubs and houses of culture, especially in the Ukraine, in Georgia, in the Russian Federation, and in the first instance in Pskov, Yaroslavl, and Irkutsk oblasts, Krasnodar kray and the Tatar SSR was subjected to criticism at the conference.

Taking part in the work of the conference was Comrade Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

PRAVDA Reports USSR Supreme Court Plenum
PM301525 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Sep 87 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Court Plenum"]

[Text] A scheduled plenum of the USSR Supreme Court has been held with V.I. Terebilov in the chair.

Following a report by USSR Supreme Court Member A.F. Demyanenko, there was discussion of the practice of the courts' enforcement of the law governing the financial liability of officials, workers, and employees in respect of material damage caused to enterprises, institutions, and organizations.

About 200,000 claims are filed with the courts each year in respect of financial liability by persons guilty of inflicting damage on production. The claims filed by

enterprises, institutions, and organizations or originated by prosecutors amounted to R147 million in 1986. Claims totaling R90 million were adjudged justified and were satisfied. A resolution adopted by the plenum draws the courts' attention to several serious mistakes and defects in the hearing of cases falling within this category, and provides additional clarifications.

Following a report by V.V. Shubin, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Court, and USSR Supreme Court Member R.G. Tikhomirov, there was discussion of the question of how RSFSR courts fulfill the USSR Supreme Court's 1 November 1985 resolution "On the Practice of Courts' Enforcement of Legislation Aimed at Stepping up the Struggle Against Drunkenness and Alcoholism."

The plenum noted that the RSFSR Supreme Court had implemented a series of measures aimed at overcoming drunkenness and alcoholism, but the effect of these measures on the level of judicial activity in the enforcement of antialcohol legislation remains insufficient. The RSFSR Supreme Court's attention was drawn to the need to improve the courts' practical work on the enforcement of antialcohol legislation, to enhance the standards of the organization and procedure of circuit court sessions in this context, and to issue interlocutory orders in sharp response to any omissions or shortcomings that may come to light.

USSR Deputy Minister of Justice V.T. Gubarev briefed the USSR Supreme Court plenum on the results of the 21 June 1987 elections of people's judges and people's assessors for rayon (city) people's courts, kray, oblast, and city courts, and autonomous oblast and autonomous okrug courts.

The elections were held in an atmosphere of enhanced voter activeness in the conditions of glasnost and restructuring. Judges attended more than 160,000 report-back sessions and meetings with voters during the election campaign. Working people made more than 20,000 critical remarks and suggestions concerning questions of improving judicial activity.

Following a report by I.-A.P. Misyunas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Court, there was discussion of certain results of that court's work in the first 6 months of 1987 and its tasks stemming from the CPSU Central Committee January and June (1987) Plenums decisions.

The plenum also heard court case appeals by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court and the USSR general prosecutor.

Taking part in the plenum's work were USSR Acting General Prosecutor N.A. Bazhenov and USSR Minister of Justice B.V. Kravtsov.

CPSU CC Approves Restructuring of Political Studies

LD251448 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1000 GMT 25 Sep 87

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has adopted a decision on restructuring the system of political and economic studies for working people.

The draft by the party Central Committee which had previously been submitted for a wide discussion, received the support and approval of communists and nonparty members as a specific program for action on this important section of ideological work. Numerous proposals and more precise formulations were tabled, the greater part of which were taken into account in finalizing the draft.

The CPSU Central Committee has approved the main guidelines for restructuring the system of political and economic studies for working people.

This document will be published in the magazine *Political Education*.

PRAVDA Report on Political Studies Resolution

PM011515 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Sep 87 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has adopted a resolution "On the Restructuring of the System of Working People's Political and Economic Studies."

The resolution notes that the CPSU Central Committee draft "Basic Guidelines for the Restructuring of the System of Working People's Political and Economic Studies" have met with the support and approval of Communists, nonparty people, propagandists, and students, who assessed them as a concrete action program for this important sector of ideological work. The document has been widely discussed in party, Komsomol, and trade union organizations, in ministries and departments, at party-economic and ideological aktiv conferences, in Universities of Marxism-leninism, at seminars and in schools, and in the mass media. Numerous proposals and clarifications were put forward, many of which were taken into account during the finalization of the draft.

The measures proposed for the restructuring of studies are based on the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee January and June (1987) Plenums on strengthening Marxist-leninist theoretical training and the ideological and moral tempering of cadres and instilling in Soviet people high political standards, modern economic thinking, and a profound

understanding of the essence of the party's course of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development and renewing all spheres of social life.

The CPSU Central Committee has approved the "Basic Guidelines for Restructuring the System of Working People's Political and Economic Studies." The document will be published in the journal *Politicheskoye Obrazovaniye*.

Union republic communist party central committees, party kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorlkoms, and raykoms, primary party organizations, USSR ministries and departments, union republic councils of ministers, economic leaders, the AUCCTU, trade union committees and councils, the Komsomol Central Committee, and Komsomol organizations are instructed, in accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and subsequent plenums, to elaborate and implement measures to restructure the system of working people's political and economic studies and to radically improve the quality and fruitfulness of classes.

It is deemed necessary to update the content of political and economic studies and to reinforce their link with life and with the solution of key tasks in accelerating society's socioeconomic development. Full use is to be made of the ideological wealth of the CPSU Program, the materials of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee plenums, and other party documents in order to instill in Communists, Komsomol members, and nonparty people an integral dialectical materialist world outlook and to enhance their labor and social activeness. In analyzing the actual processes taking place in our country and in the world, it is necessary to firmly rely on the Marxist-leninist methodology in studying reality and to profoundly assimilate and creatively apply the ideological and theoretical heritage of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V.I. Lenin. Active use is to be made of the wealth of historical experience of the CPSU and the fraternal parties in the education of Communists and the working people. Consideration of working people's interests and requirements, high ideological and theoretical standards, the application of progressive forms and methods and the latest technical teaching aids, and efficient organization and supervision must be regarded as key demands regarding the organization of training in current conditions.

It is necessary steadily to increase the practical effect and impact of studies on all aspects of the life of party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations and labor collectives and on creating in them an atmosphere of creative enthusiasm for working in the new fashion, high responsibility on the part of everyone for their assigned task, mutual exactingness, a vigorous quest for reserves for acceleration, and intolerance of shortcomings and everything that hampers our progress.

The task has been set of elaborating and introducing in all labor collectives a system for recording, generalizing, and implementing proposals submitted by students and of examining them within set deadlines on an equal footing with the proposals put forward by working people in the press and at party and general meetings. Responsibility for the introduction of these proposals is to be borne by economic, party, and trade union leaders of enterprises and organizations.

Party committees are instructed to reorganize the organizational structure of the system of Marxist-Leninist education of Communists and nonparty people. It must be flexible and constantly updated and must take account of new practical demands and people's growing spiritual needs. It is planned to concentrate party studies mainly at Universities of Marxism-Leninism, political and methodological seminars, and political schools. It is planned to develop as the main component of a modern system of studies the independent study by Communists and nonparty people of party theory and policy in accordance with individual programs.

Extensive use is to be made of democratic principles in the organization of political studies. Party organizations are granted the right to independently determine their structure in the light of students' interests, their educational level, the nature of their production and social activity, and collectives' specific features and tasks, proceeding from the availability of skilled propagandists and training materials and facilities. The mandatory nature of systematic studies by Communists and Komsomol members must be combined with freedom of choice as regards the forms of study and courses.

With a view to further improving the system of Marxist-Leninist education, it is planned to conduct a consistent quest for new approaches to the organization of studies, to carry out experiments, and to study, generalize, and introduce progressive experience.

The Komsomol Central Committee has been instructed to implement a restructuring of Komsomol political studies in accordance with the demands of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 20th Komsomol Congress. In current conditions these studies are called upon to inculcate in young men and women a communist world outlook, high moral qualities, and responsibility for the fate of socialism, peace, and the future of our motherland. Political education must be closely geared to practical affairs, take account of young people's increased spiritual requirements, provide them with the correct social guidelines, and contribute to their active involvement in the process of the renewal and democratization of society. Its most important mission is to inculcate high civic-mindedness, patriotism and internationalism, the ability to defend socialism's ideals and spiritual values from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint, and intolerance of the standards of the bourgeois way of life.

The task has been set of widely utilizing modern forms and methods of training young people and organizing political discussions and meetings with scientists, production innovators, and creative workers.

Party committees are called upon to give all-around assistance to Komsomol organizations in the restructuring of political studies. Work with young people must be entrusted to the best propagandists, their theoretical training must be conducted purposefully, and constant concern must be shown for enhancing their methodological skill.

The Komsomol Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee All-union Political Enlightenment Center, the Komsomol Central Committee Higher Komsomol School, the Political Literature Publishing House, and the "Molodaya Gvardiya" Publishing House are instructed to create textbooks and methodological manuals which take account of the special characteristics and requirements of young students.

The CPSU Central Committee instructs ministries and departments, economic leaders, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, together with the AUCCTU, to implement a merger of mass economic and vocational studies in the 12th 5-Year Plan and to make them part of the state system for improving the skill of and retraining cadres. A switch from periodical to continuous production and economic training ensuring the constant updating and supplementing of economic, scientific, and technical knowledge and the enhancement of working people's professional skills is to be largely completed in all sectors of the national economy by the end of the current 5-year plan.

The link is to be strengthened between changes of skill category and grading, transfers to different posts, and labor remuneration and the level of workers' vocational training and the efficiency with which they apply their economic knowledge in practice. Additions specifying the requisite level of economic knowledge for every category of employee are to be added to the job skills handbook for leaders, specialists, and employees and to the unified wage rate and skills handbook for all worker jobs and trades.

It is deemed expedient to set up integrated production and economic training subdivisions and to staff them with experienced methodologists and other specialists.

The USSR State Committee for Statistics has been instructed to make appropriate changes to statistical reporting on cadre training and skill improvement.

Responsibility for the leadership of production and economic studies in national economic sectors is to be borne by the relevant ministries and departments.

Coordination of ministry and department activities in the production and economic training of working people is to be ensured by the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development.

Overall leadership and supervision of this work will be carried out by the Economic Department and sector departments of the CPSU Central Committee, union republic communist party central committees, and party kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms.

The AUCCTU, trade union central committees and councils, and trade union committees are instructed, in close cooperation with ministries, departments, local economic organs, and the administration of associations, enterprises, and institutions, to ensure the organization of the production and economic training of workers and kolkhoz members in schools of socialist management and other forms of studies, to strengthen the training material base, and to ensure the training of propagandists. Various forms of mass production propaganda such as schools of progressive experience, quality groups and circles, scientific and technical societies and clubs, and other forms are to be persistently developed. The work of departments, offices, and other subunits of trade union organs responsible for cadre training is to be restructured.

Union republic communist party central committees, party kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms, primary party organizations, USSR ministries and departments, the AUCCTU, and the Komsomol Central Committee, in accordance with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum, are instructed to develop as from the 1987/1988 academic year universal elementary economic education, which is called upon to instill modern economic thinking in all Soviet people and to teach the working people economic methods of management and the skills needed to operate in conditions of full economic accountability, democratization of production life, and self-management. It is necessary to radically improve the economic training of specialists for all national economic sectors at economic VUZ'S and corresponding faculties of other educational establishments. The system of training, retraining, and skill improvement for party, soviet, economic, and trade union cadres must be restructured, centering their training on the practical acquisition of modern methods of management. It is necessary to organize in all labor collectives courses for workers, kolkhoz members, and specialists to study the new system of economic management and to prepare workers well in advance for enterprises' switch to the new methods of management.

A plan of measures to provide universal economic education in the country in the light of the decisions of the 27th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum has been ratified.

The CPSU Central Committee Propaganda, Science and Educational Institutions, and Economic Departments, the AUCCTU, the Komsomol Central Committee, ministries and departments, and party, trade union, and economic organs have been instructed to improve their scientific and methodological leadership of the systems of political studies and production and economic training, and the coordination of the activities of scientific institutions, educational establishments, and the mass media in this direction.

It was deemed expedient to continue study of the courses "The Acceleration of the Country's Socioeconomic Development Is the CPSU'S Strategic Line" and "Production Intensification" in the 1987/88 academic year. The CPSU Central Committee All-Union Political Enlightenment Center, Academy of Social Sciences, Institute of Marxism-Leninism, and Social Sciences Institute and higher party schools have been instructed to ensure the timely, good-quality preparation of programs, textbooks, and teaching aids conforming to present-day demands and making possible the transition to the new system of political studies as of the 1988/89 academic year.

The USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, the AUCCTU Higher School of the Trade Union Movement named for N.M. Shvernik, skill improvement institutes, and training subunits at ministries, departments, and trade union organs have been tasked with organizing the development, publication, and systematic renewal of educational plans, programs, and textbooks for the production and economic training of leading workers, national economic specialists, workers, and kolkhoz members. Paramount attention should be devoted to creating textbooks and teaching aids for the study of the new economic management system.

Ministries, departments, and trade union central committees have been instructed to prepare sectorial materials for the system of working people's production and economic education. Extensive use should be made of journals, abstracts, and bulletins for this purpose. Publication is permitted of training and information materials for propaganda workers and students under the sectorial plans for the publication of official and in-house literature within the limits of the prescribed annual volume.

It is planned to step up the assistance given to teachers, propaganda workers, students, and study organizers from the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, scientific and technical information centers, science and technology centers, and scientific and technical libraries. The practice of creating information centers at enterprises and associations was approved.

The USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, central, sectorial, and republic publishing houses, the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, the all-union "Melodiya" firm, and the "Diafilm" studio have been instructed to publish textbooks and printed, visual, and audio training aids and to send them to local book trade organizations by the start of the academic year.

Newspaper and journal editorial offices have been instructed to regularly publish theoretical and methodological articles for propaganda workers and students. The USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting is to organize special programs on problems being studied in the political studies and production and economic training systems. Positive experience of political studies and production and economic training is to be constantly propagandized in labor collectives.

It is deemed expedient to change the name of the journal *Politicheskoye Samoobrazovaniye* to the CPSU Central Committee journal *Politicheskoye Obrazovaniye* and to increase its publication from 12 to 18 issues a year.

It is recommended that proposals be drawn up on fundamentally improving the production of technical means of propaganda and training, along with audio, visual, and print aids, on streamlining the range of such items, and on developing and issuing fundamentally new types of apparatus, auxiliary equipment, and means of presenting information. Specific measures are to be determined to improve trade in visual aids and technical facilities, to provide for their servicing and repair and the proper advertising and information support, and to plan and coordinate the actions of ministries and departments engaged in the production of information technology and electronic teaching aids.

The USSR Ministry of Communications has been instructed to organize subscriptions for visual and audio aids for political studies and production and economic training as of 1989 and to ensure their timely delivery.

The resolution stresses that the key problem in restructuring studies is the improvement of the selection and training of propaganda cadres. Propaganda workers must be genuine proponents of acceleration and actively help the party in its struggle for the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society. Party organizers must nominate for this work highly idealistic, respected, and erudite Communists and nonparty people able to convince people and attract them through their personal example. Propaganda workers must be armed with profound knowledge of theory, politics, teaching methods, and psychology, they must develop the skill and habits needed to use active teaching methods and technical means of propaganda, and they must be regularly briefed about the activity of local organs and progress in fulfilling socioeconomic development plans.

Particular attention must be devoted to work with the reserve and with new propaganda workers. To this end it is planned to make better use of the Universities of Marxism-Leninism, teaching establishments (subunits) in the system for improving skills, and social professions faculties at VUZ'S. Propaganda workers' training should be improved at 2-week courses held away from their main place of work, at standing seminars organized by local party, economic, and trade union organs, and also directly at associations and enterprises.

Favorable conditions must be created for propaganda workers' work, their prestige must be enhanced, and incentives must be provided for their noble work, which requires genuine commitment and considerable expenditure of time, effort, and spiritual energy. Propaganda workers should not be overburdened with other social tasks.

It was deemed expedient to prepare and hold a First All-union Rally of Propaganda Workers to examine the progress of the restructuring of political and economic studies. A Propaganda Workers' Day is to be held every year on the last Saturday in September with a view to exchanging experience.

The CPSU Central Committee instructed union republic communist party central committees and party kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms to fundamentally improve their leadership of political studies and production and economic education, viewing them as complementary aspects of working people's ideological, theoretical, and vocational training and part and parcel of the party's cadre policy. Instances of indifferent and disdainful attitudes to studies were condemned and the task was set of resolutely putting a stop to the undervaluation of studies. Personal responsibility for the theoretical training and ideological and moral tempering of cadres was entrusted to first secretaries. It was laid down that the most important duty of secretaries, department chiefs, and other party workers is to speak at classes, participate in talks, and brief propaganda workers and study organizers on the most important questions of the party's domestic and foreign policy and the work of local organizations.

It is planned to enhance the role of primary party organizations—the main link in work to restructure the system of working people's political and economic studies. It is proposed to hold discussions with Communists at primary party organizations and to hear reports from them on the improvement of their ideological and political standards. Members of party committees, party apparatus workers, and Communist leaders must set an example in acquiring knowledge of the party's theory and policy.

It is planned to enhance the role of political enlightenment centers and rooms as training and organizational centers. Their activities must be concentrated on training propaganda cadres, drawing up methodological recommendations for the conduct of classes, developing

information materials, studying, generalizing, and disseminating the experience of propaganda work, and monitoring the quality and effectiveness of political studies.

Political enlightenment centers and rooms are to be reinforced with theoretically competent cadres with experience of party political and scientific training work.

With a view to improving the training of propaganda cadres it is planned to combine the Universities of Marxism-Leninism with political enlightenment centers. The structure of the Universities of Marxism-Leninism will be changed—they will include faculties of propaganda cadres, mass political work, and the party and economic aktiv. It has been laid down that university graduation information will be included on the personal record cards of Communists and Komsomol members.

It is planned to introduce a system for retraining senior center workers and teachers at Universities of Marxism-Leninism at the CPSU Central Committee All-union Political Enlightenment Center, the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, and higher party schools.

It has been deemed necessary to strengthen the material and technical base of the CPSU Central Committee All-Union Political Enlightenment Center. It will be tasked with preparing standard training programs, textbooks, and methodological materials for the political studies system; with studying, generalizing, and disseminating the experience of party propaganda and agitation work; with introducing the achievements of teacher training, psychology, and sociology into the practice of propaganda work; with improving the skill of cadres at political enlightenment centers; and with conducting experiments together with party committees and approving new forms and methods of propaganda work.

Grishkyavichus Speaks at Lithuanian CP CC Plenum

18000788a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
31 Jul 87 pp 1-3

[Report by Lithuanian CP CC First Secretary P.P. Grishkyavichus at 7th Lithuanian CP CC Plenum, 30 Jul 87: "On the Tasks of the Republic Party Organization for Fundamentally Restructuring the Management of the Economy in Accordance with the Resolutions of the Jun 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades!

The logically consistent and energetically-conducted Central Committee Plenum held by the CPSU Central Committee in April 1985 and the 27th CPSU Congress on restructuring and accelerating the country's socioeconomic development is having an increasingly profound effect on all spheres of life of Soviet society. The June

1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum opened a new stage in the implementation of this policy. It examined questions of enormous importance, made an in-depth political analysis of the course of restructuring, pointed to its initial results, and spoke frankly of the difficulties and shortcomings.

Comrade Gorbachev's report comprehensively substantiated the necessity for fundamental restructuring of the management of the economy and convincingly disclosed its essence and the principles of its implementation.

The Central Committee Plenum has given its approval to "The Basic Principles of Fundamental Restructuring of the Management of the Economy," a most important political document. The USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) was approved by the Plenum and was subsequently enacted by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Draft decrees of the party central committee and the government were approved, which concerned restructuring the activities of central, republic and local administrative organs; the planning system; the price-setting system; and other normative acts.

The Plenum adopted a resolution to hold the 19th All-Union Party Conference on 28 June 1988. This will be a major political event in the life of the party and the nation, and for us, the Communists, will become a political examination on the main question of our lives and activities—restructuring.

It is especially fitting to point to the atmosphere in which the June Plenum took place. It was characterized by a sober analysis of the course of the restructuring, its successes and achievements; an in-depth analysis of the work and criticism of its shortcomings; and an open and businesslike discussion of urgent problems. In all of this the Plenum demonstrated total unity of views and evaluations on all questions discussed. It was thus once again proven that the policy chosen by the party for strengthening and improving socialism is the proper one, and the unswerving determination was expressed to firmly and persistently implement the restructuring and acceleration with ever-greater energy.

It is now a matter of active and constructive work. The main thing now is to act energetically and purposefully, tirelessly carry on the search for new forms and methods of work, and deepen democracy and openness. Many problems have arisen and they will not all be resolved at one stroke. There are and there will be difficulties, but we must overcome them. To do this, as it was stressed at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, every party organ and organization must operate creatively and decisively, and not be afraid to make a mistake. Mistakes are possible in every great cause, and no one is insured against them. But we must work and reorganize boldly and confidently; we must correct the situation on a timely basis; and we must constantly strive for progress.

Today at the Central Committee Plenum we must thoroughly analyze the course of restructuring in the republic, and define the specific tasks for carrying out the resolutions of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The process of economic transformations has also begun in our republic. Transferring to conditions of total cost accounting and self-financing are all enterprises of Minlegprom [Ministry of Light Industry] and Minvodkhov [Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources], state and cooperative trade, and 18 associations and enterprises of union subordination. Operating under the new procedure for supplying material-technical resources to trade are 96 enterprises and organizations, and state acceptance of products is in operation at 41 enterprises. A portion of the most progressive kolkhozes and sovkhozes are in fact operating under total cost accounting and self financing. Efforts aimed at increasing the returns on fixed assets have been stepped up. And a front of operations on reconstruction and technical retooling of existing production is being expanded.

The work undertaken has begun to yield its first results. During the last two years we have succeeded in increasing the profit margin of many branches of the national economy, accelerating the process of renovating production assets, and increasing responsibility for observing state discipline. The average growth rate of labor productivity has surpassed the average annual indicators of the 11th Five Year Plan in the republic's industry by 20 percent; in agriculture, by 40 percent; and in construction by a factor of 2. Industrial production volume has grown at a rate which outstrips the planned rate. This year for the first time the entire increase in production here was provided by virtue of growth in labor productivity. Positive changes are taking place in other branches of the republic's economy as well.

Additional capabilities have been sought to strengthen the material base of the social sphere. For these purposes over 800 million rubles have been allocated, above that of the five-year plan.

However, we cannot and do not have the right to ignore the fact that far less has been done than we were capable of and should have done. In certain branches and at many enterprises positive trends have been shown to be quite weak and have not yet taken on a consistent nature. This was especially evident at the beginning of this year. The severe winter exposed serious shortcomings in the organization and management of production.

The measures which were taken permitted correcting the situation as a whole in the second quarter. Planned tasks established for the first half of the year were on the whole fulfilled in industry, in the agroindustrial complex and in other branches of the national economy. The effectiveness of the national economy grew somewhat and there are positive achievements in improving the well-being of the populace.

However, in terms of the main indicator—realization of industrial production in consideration of obligations for its delivery—the plan for the first half of the year was fulfilled by 99.7 percent. Fourteen enterprises, or more than 4.0 percent of their total number, were unable to cope with this task. In comparison with the same period last year, the volume of uncompleted production has grown significantly. Over 7.0 percent of the industrial collectives have not fulfilled their production plans, and 9.6 percent have not fulfilled the plan for labor productivity. Ten enterprises were unable to cope with the plan for goods production of the highest quality category. These collectives include the electrical apparatus plant in Kedaynyay, the compressor plant in Mazheykyay, the Elfa Electrical Equipment Plant in Vilnius, the Machine Tool Building Plant imeni 40th Anniversary of the October Revolution, and a number of others. Moreover, these are on the whole the same enterprises cited for their poor work in report after report, and the situation doesn't change. The responsible departments of the central committee and above all the party gorkoms and raykoms should draw the proper conclusions from this. Minpromstroyaterialov [Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry], Minmestprom [Ministry of Local Industry], Goskomizdat [State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade], and 68 other enterprises did not fulfill their plans this year for reduction production costs.

The technical level and the quality of machine-building production cannot but alarm us. As you know, these questions were posed with respect to principle and with asperity at a recently-held CPSU Central Committee meeting. A significant portion of our production in machines, machine tools, equipment and instruments cannot as before withstand the competition from the best of similar models from home or abroad. And production of morally-obsolete articles continues.

Overcoming the technical backwardness of machine building must be given the most rigid attention. After all, half of the machines and equipment should be modernized right now and one-fourth should be replaced. We ourselves must set about creating and manufacturing new technology and equipment, as they have done at the Sigma Production Association and at the drill bit plant in Vilnius. Unfortunately most of the machine-building plants, the Elfa and Neris Production Associations, and other enterprises are allowing matters to proceed at a slow pace.

Once again we must speak of increasing the intensive-ness of use of production capacities and in particular of introducing two and three-shift operations on highly-productive equipment. We have adopted fine resolutions on this account, but thus far they are essentially not being implemented. Meanwhile the shift index for the equipment continues to decline. This year it declined at every third enterprise checked, and on the whole in the cities of Kaunas, Klaypeda, Shyaulay, Alitus and Kapuskas. The Council of Ministers (Comrade Yu.

Rusenko), the appropriate ministries, and local party and soviet administrators must turn things around more rapidly and finally get this important matter off dead center.

State acceptance authorities have disclosed major shortcomings in the work of our industry. According to the totals for the first six months, every fourth enterprise working under state acceptance conditions has failed to fulfill its production plan.

At the Zhalgiris Machine Tool Building Plant in Vilnius (Comrade Yu. Sivitskiy, director) one-fourth of the production is returned for modification. Total confusion reigns at the Vilnius radio parts plant (Comrade A. Linartas, director), where to this day they cannot reliably determine the quality of their products because of the lack of suitable test equipment.

The situation in capital construction has become worse. The plan for putting into operation residential houses, children's preschool institutions, vocational-technical schools, clubs and houses of culture was not fulfilled; nor was the plan for putting fixed capital on line. The Ministry of Construction (Comrade B. Sheshplaukis) was unable to cope with the plan for contract work, and many organizations of Litagropromstroy [Lithuanian Agroindustrial Construction Administration] reduced their volume of this work. They have also gotten stuck on socio-cultural-domestic projects. Is it not time for Comrades A. Brazauskas and V. Kazanavichyus to give some thought to what we must do in order that the names of these administrators are not so often heard from the rostrum of central committee plenums?

In consideration of the urgent necessity for resolving acute social problems and for satisfying in the most expeditious manner the daily needs and necessities of the working people, the CPSU Central Committee is calling the special attention of party, soviet and economic organs to the top priority questions outlined at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Among them first place goes to increasing the responsibility of local authorities for resolving the food problem.

Primarily this means assimilating intensive technologies, introducing the contract form of labor organization everywhere, and the social transformation of the rural area. On all of these main sectors something has already been done in the republic and this is providing certain results. Last year, as you know, the plan for sales to the state was fulfilled for all basic kinds of products. And the plan for procurement of animal husbandry products has been fulfilled for the first six months of the current year.

But the reserves are far from exhausted: in many rayons and on many farms they are simply utilized poorly; major deficiencies were permitted to occur, and here and there they have even surrendered their previously-won positions. This was frankly and properly pointed out to us not long ago in a recent CPSU Central Committee

resolution, and we spoke sharply about it at preceding plenums of the Lithuanian CP [CPLi] Central Committee. But we have something to talk about today also, because the conclusions are being made sluggishly and at an unacceptably slow pace.

Here are a few facts for you, the most recent: according to the results for the first six months, in comparison with the same period last year, meat production has not shown significant growth—only 4.0 percent. And this is primarily because of the fact that on 276 farms, or one-fourth of all kolkhozes and sovkhozes, it not only has not increased but has actually declined. Weight gains for cattle on the feedlot amount to only 577 grams on the average. This year they lost weight on the farms of 18 rayons. In Vilkavishskiy, Ionavskiy, Yurbarskiy, Anikshyayskiy, Raseynskiy and Zarasayskiy Rayons they lost 500 grams. How and with what are they feeding cattle on the Barupe Sovkhoz in Ionavskiy Rayon (Comrade A. Vaychyushka, director) if the average daily weight gain amounts to only 224 grams? And why does Comrade E. Prihodskis tolerate such an administrator?

Nor were there any noteworthy achievements in hog raising. Weight gains for feedlot hogs were lower than planned and amounted to only 465 grams on the average. In Kayshyadorskiy, Vilkavishskiy and Utenskiy Rayons they did not even reach 400 grams. How can one explain the fact that in Birzhayskiy, Pasvalskiy and Prenayskiy Rayons this year the selling weight of calves declined by 14-20 kg, and in Yurbarskiy Rayon by a whole 30 kg? This is nothing other than the result of the command-pressure style of work, trying to fulfill the current plan at any price, and escape criticism for deficiencies in the organization of meat production. It is high time to relegate such work methods to the history books.

But what should be especially alarming to us is the situation which has come to pass with milk yields. Instead of the 100 kg in accordance with the annual requirement, for the first six months milk yield from cows increased by only 12 kg. In terms of the growth rate for milk yield we are lagging behind all the neighboring republics. In Vilkavishskiy, Pasvalskiy, Pakruoyskiy, Ignalinskiy and Birzhayskiy Rayons, milk yield from cows has declined on the average by 31 to 64 kg. The Lithuanian CP Central Committee Buro has warned the administrators of Vilkavishskiy, Pakruoyskiy and Pasvalskiy Rayons as well as Comrade V. Stankavichyus, deputy chairman of the republic Gosagroprom [State Agroindustrial Commission] of their personal responsibility for the state of affairs in the dairy business.

In many rayons and on many farms they still do not devote the proper attention to the needs of the private subsidiary farms of the rural populace. A considerable portion of the villagers do not possess the proper conditions for setting up such a farm or for raising products for their own needs and for sale to this state. This applies primarily to land reclamation workers, to workers at

rural vocational-technical schools and general educational schools. Why, for example, are houses and apartments for country teachers and other personnel still built without farm sheds? Comrades A. Chesnavichus, V. Spruga and other administrators connected with this question should make the proper conclusions.

In this connection it is a good time to reiterate an excerpt from the report on the latest session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. There it is stated that in order to increase the contribution of the private subsidiary farms of the citizens in solving the food problem, it is recommended that the norms for keeping cattle and the size limits of subsidiary farms be re-examined. It is planned to improve the supply of feed to the citizens' farms, as well as young livestock and poultry, small mechanical implements, and so on. Consequently, our cadres—not only the economic but also the party and soviet cadres—must consciously change their way of thinking on the given question.

At the June Central Committee Plenum attention was given to the introduction of family contracts as the best method of combining social and private interests. Family contracts have already received a certain amount of recognition in the republic this year: 137,000 contracts have been signed with farms for raising cattle and poultry and for raising crops. There are quite a few examples of the high effectiveness of this form of contract. For example, on the Tituvenay Sovkhoz in Kelmiskiy Rayon and on Zhaydyalyay Kolchoz in Kupishskiy Rayon they are adapting old abandoned and empty structures for fattening cattle and hogs by the family contract method.

In order to develop production by the family contract method, we must make wide use of the vacant farmsteads (khutor), of which there are more than 1,000. The farms could acquire them and even sell them to city dwellers on the condition that they would raise and sell products to the state. One would think that solving these questions on the basis of the latest government decrees would be a matter for the Council of Ministers and the ispolkoms of the local soviets.

As stressed at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, considerable growth resources accrue from developing subsidiary agriculture at enterprises and organizations. But the tasks established for the 12th Five Year Plan for developing subsidiary agriculture are not being carried out. With the exception of Minvodkhoz, in whose system 18 subsidiary farms were established this year, the remaining ministries and departments and union-level enterprises have not commenced organizing them. The task has been set to completely satisfy in the near future requests from citizens for allocation of garden and orchard plots. According to calculations at the present time it would not take all that much to satisfy the requests of the workers—only about 4,000 hectares. Red tape cannot be allowed to interfere with this matter.

In a word, we must make use of all our capabilities to increase output of agricultural products. But it is no less important that all of it finds its way to the tables of the consumers in the form of high-quality food products. We have examined more than once the questions of developing the processing industry of the agro-industrial complex, and they have not yet been dropped from the agenda of central committee plenums. And rightly so.

In order to solve these problems, a number of documents have been drawn up and adopted by the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Buro. However, they are being carried out poorly. Last year 1.7 million rubles worth of construction-installation work was not assimilated. In the first six months of this year the plan for construction-installation work was underfulfilled by more than 1,000,000 rubles and only one-third of the assets stipulated in the annual plan have been assimilated. Neither Ministroy nor all the contracting organs of Gosagroprom (Comrade Yu. Bernatavichus) were able to cope with the planned tasks. It turns out that in actuality the matter of implementing the party's instructions on priority development for processing branches and storage bases is extremely slow to progress beyond the talking stage.

Planning and production discipline is poor at a number of food enterprises. This applies especially to enterprises which process fruit and vegetable products and fish. Last year the task for production of certain fruit and vegetable preserves which are in demand remained undone. The situation at enterprises of Litrybprom (Lithuanian Fishing Industry) was similar.

Nor can one ignore the question of the quality of food products. Noteworthy changes for the better have not been noted for many products. Authorities at Gosstandart have rejected fish products, non-alcoholic beverages, meat and dairy products, and bread and pastry products, especially at enterprises of Litpotrebsoyuz [Lithuanian Union of Consumer Cooperatives]. For many of these products the amount of spoilage has actually increased this year. The things which are taking place are simply inexplicable and incredible. Are the bakers at Litpotrebsoyuz really incapable of baking bread which meets the standards? Someone needs to learn a thing or two. Comrade V. Ramanauskas must put things in order in his organization in a hurry.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum once again called our attention to the necessity of doing everything possible to solve a most important social problem—to provide practically every family a separate apartment or house by the year 2000.

The housing problem in the republic remains acute as before. In spite of introducing 30,000 apartments every year the number of people who need housing is not going down and at the present time amounts to more than

145,000 families. In the cities about 16 percent of the families still live in common apartments. The emergency housing fund is growing and it has already surpassed a million square meters.

A great deal of work lies ahead, and the rate of housing construction must be increased without delay. But this is not yet happening. Gosplan (Comrade B. Zaykauskas) has unacceptably dragged out the development of a housing construction program for the period up to the year 2000. Thus far only preliminary estimates have been made. But even these show that in order to solve the problem in the period prescribed by the party, the housing construction rate for the next 15 years will have to be increased by a factor 1.5 times as high as it has been thus far. Additional reserves must be relentlessly sought out. Measures should be considered for encouraging construction of housing at the expense of the populace, giving free rein to cooperative and individual construction both in the villages and in the cities. It is especially important to remove all restrictions on such construction in the cities.

But the most important thing is to increase in every way the capacity of the construction industry and the production-technical base of the construction organizations. A top priority task for Minstroy is to complete as soon as possible the reorganization of the Shyaulyay housing construction combine and the Vilnius Construction Design Association, and increase the capacities of other housing construction combines to the necessary level by the end of the five-year plan. Gosagroprom must quickly put the Panevezhis Rural Construction Combine into operation. And the entire construction industry must work at full capacity. Naturally it is exceptionally important to develop in every way the production of building materials.

And yet another point. In solving all the above-mentioned problems, the forces and assets of the client ministries, associations and enterprises must be applied to the maximum, regardless of their subordination. This business should be supervised by Gosplan, and city and rayon ispolkoms.

The rate of construction of socio-cultural projects in the countryside deserves individual attention. Litagropromstroy has failed to fulfill the plan for the first six months. The plan was not fulfilled for construction of both individual and cooperative housing and the annual plan is threatened with failure. It was stressed at the preceding plenum that questions of socio-cultural construction and rebuilding the villages in general must be taken under the direct supervision of the local soviet authorities.

And now on goods and services. Although our republic was placed on the plus side at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, this provides no grounds for complacency and self-satisfaction: all the more so, since this year certain problems associated with the production of non-food commodities have become much more severe.

According to the six-month totals, 7.0 percent of the republic's enterprises were unable to cope with the plan for consumer goods production. The task for production of cultural-domestic and household articles was not fulfilled. And this places the annual plan under threat of failure.

Gosplan, ministries and departments, branch sections of the CPLi Central Committee, the Administration of Affairs of the republic Council of Ministers, party gorkoms and raykoms and local soviet organs must tighten up control over the formulation of plans for production of consumer goods. This is especially important right now, as plans for 1988 are being developed.

Great responsibility is being laid on the Ministry of Light Industry. But it is as if the administration of the branch, which is orienting itself on working from orders from trade, is not trying very hard to carry out the tasks of the Comprehensive Program for Developing Production of Consumer Goods and the Services Sphere. The draft plan for 1988 submitted by the ministry for production of knitted wares, children's shoes and cotton, woolen and silk fabrics was defined below that which the Program calls for. And this, under conditions in which these goods—and especially the children's assortment—are sorely lacking, to which Comrade I. Ramanauskas pointed directly at the recent session of the republic's Supreme Soviet. The production volumes stipulated in the Program must be unconditionally fulfilled.

Non-specializing enterprises as well as local industry must make an increasing contribution to satisfy the market for consumer goods. However Minmestprom (Comrade G. Simenenko) is still slowly and reluctantly letting go of the old management methods and micro-managing the enterprises, and is in no hurry to transfer his subordinate enterprises to total profit and loss management. This also pertains to Minmebelbumprom [LiSSR Ministry of the Furniture and Wood Processing Industry] (Comrade K. Minyotas) as well as certain enterprises of union subordination, which up to now are participating only symbolically in production of consumer goods.

All of this is having a negative effect on the results of the work of trade and domestic services. The plan for retail goods turnover in state and cooperative trade was fulfilled by 99.5 percent for the first half of 1987. Goods turnover volume in comparison with the same period last year declined by almost 1.0 percent, or by 23 million rubles. The trade organs of the cities of Vilnius, Kaunas and the rayon unions of consumer societies of Ukmeriskiy, Radvilishskiy and a number of other rayons failed to cope with the tasks for the first six months.

The basic reason is the shortage of trade resources. Mintorg (Comrade P. Miskunas), Litpotrebsoyuz (Comrade V. Ramanauskas) are still not applying strong pressure on the enterprises and facilities producing the goods required by the republic market. Trade is slow to

expand in salable industrial by-products and second-hand goods, and there are still a lot of complaints on the organization of supply of lumber and building materials to the public. Stricter control is needed here on the part of the party gorkoms and raykoms, and more energetic work on the part of ispolkoms of soviets of people's deputies.

The development of cooperative and individual labor activity of the citizens is proceeding timidly. About 400 cooperatives have been set up in the republic. However, half the cooperatives are at the organizational stage and have not yet commenced their activities. This is the result of the fact that hardly any local soviet authorities have accepted the fact that encouragement and development of cooperative activities is a vital matter for them. They must provide assistance to entrepreneurs, without red tape, in acquiring equipment and in providing raw materials and supplies.

There is a great deal of slackness in the sphere of local-municipal utilities, in passenger transport, in communications, tourism, physical culture and sports. Gosagroprom, Minkhleoproductov [Ministry of Bakery Products], the Kaunas Machine Tool Building Association imeni F. Dzerzhinskiy, the Kaunas Artificial Fiber Plant imeni 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution, the Panevezhis Automotive Compressor Plant and a number of others have failed to cope with their tasks for rendering paid services.

The CPLi Central Committee, the Council of Ministers, and local party and soviet organizations receive a large number of complaints for unsatisfactory work by the housing and municipal services authorities, for interruptions in the supply of heat and water, for slow response to emergencies, and other problems. In this connection we must take note of the unsatisfactory work of Minkommunkhoz [LSSR Ministry of Municipal Services] (Comrade I. Razumas), which instead of organizing production of material-technical resources which they lack, instead point to their unavailability, and cast about for various and sundry justifications.

At the present time preparation for the forthcoming fall-winter season is a most important task. All branches of the national economy and ispolkoms of Soviets of people's deputies must be well-prepared for work in winter conditions, and do everything so that the mistakes and neglect of past years are no longer repeated.

The CPSU Central Committee stresses that the key to the solution of the cardinal tasks posed by the June Plenum is to ensure the active participation of the broadest segments of the popular masses in the administration of the economy. Success will be assured only when every working man feels that he is the true master at his workplace, in the collective and in society. And that is why we, selflessly setting about the fulfillment of

the practical tasks set forth by the Plenum, we must back them up with purposeful organizational, political and ideological educational work in every collective and at all levels of management.

The Central Committees and the gorkoms and raykoms of the Lithuanian CP have been called upon to lead this ever-expanding, complex and difficult work. At the same time the CPSU Central Committee is firmly oriented on the premise that they must focus all their work on the practical realization of the instructions of the Plenum primarily on the primary party organizations. But many of them to this day are not properly playing the role of the vanguard in their own collectives, they are not doing a good job in the struggle to create a pure and honest image for party members, for discipline and order in the collectives; quite often they overlook instances of drunkenness, indiscipline and irresponsibility and not only among non-party members but among certain communists as well.

What is the source of all this? Primarily and chiefly it depends on the degree of leadership of the higher party organs and above all the party gorkoms and raykoms; on how they are going about reorganizing themselves and modernizing their style and methods of operation. The all-embracing conditions of restructuring, democratization and openness also require new approaches in party leadership. The restructuring is giving birth to new experiences. Today we can proudly take note of and evaluate the fruitful work of a great many party committees under the new conditions. In-depth involvement in the problematics of restructuring and acceleration of socio-economic development, purposefulness and firmness in achieving the established goals have recently been the hallmarks of the Shyauliyay Gorkom (Comrade K. Zaitsevas, first secretary) and the Mazheyskiy (Comrade S. Gedraytis), Telshyayskiy (Comrade Ch. Sabanskis) and certain other party raykoms.

What brought about the innovations in the party leadership in, for example, Mazheyskiy Rayon, which had been at a standstill for many years? The party raykom buro under the leadership of Comrade S. Gedraytis boldly and energetically undertook the solution of the most important questions, which were of determining significance for the subsequent fate of the rayon. This meant first of all decisively breaking up the stagnation in the supervisory cadres and boldly advancing competent young administrators. In agriculture, developing the social sphere and raising the standards of farming were given primary emphasis. The raykom itself began to operate through the primary party organizations in its everyday work. Not a great deal of time has passed, but the positive achievements are already noteworthy, and most significantly, the future appears bright.

Unfortunately, in many cities and rayons and in a number of sectors of the national economy the restructuring is not making progress and is being implemented

very slowly. Certain party, soviet, trade union, Komsomol and economic organs are still playing a waiting game; they have not renounced the old command-pressure methods of leadership and bureaucratic administration, and display no initiative. Meetings and sessions and eloquent speeches about restructuring quite often are substituted for concrete matters and active work with the masses. Some of the leading cadres fail to critically analyze their own activities; they have no desire to learn and still have not learned to operate under conditions of broad democracy and openness.

This pertains to certain city and rayon party committees which, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev so aptly put it, have not kept up with the dominant mood of society and the dynamic processes taking place. Certain of these, such as for example the Kapsukas Gorkom Comrade V. Sinitskas, first secretary), the Kedayskiy Raykom (Comrade V. Povilauskas), and a number of others not only have not been genuinely leading the restructuring, but are themselves reorganizing for the new working methods at a slow pace.

In the activity of the Kapsukas Gorkom, for example, there are still a great deal of formalism, hidebound attitudes and over-organization. The resolutions which they adopt are often of a superficial nature. The gorkom has not managed to completely overcome the stagnation in its cadres. A liberal attitude is permitted with respect to violations of discipline and the anti-alcohol legislation. The gorkom is not sufficiently developing openness, criticism and self-criticism. The newspaper *Nauvasis Kyalyas*, the organ of the gorkom, is full of colorless materials which are often superficial and non-critical. It must be said that the secretaries and members of the party gorkom buro themselves do not set the example for self-criticism. And this style has filtered down to the primary party organizations. Ideological work is to a large extent banal and its effectiveness is low. This is strikingly evident in the nature of the atheist work, which is conducted on a primitive level without in-depth knowledge of the concrete situation. Major blunders in organizational and ideological work are holding back the growth rate of the economy of the region, although conditions are among the best in the republic.

The restructuring is being extended at an extremely slow pace in a number of city and rayon ispolkoms, ministries and departments; in Gosagroprom and the republic Gossnab, and in Litpotreboyuz. The republic State Planning Committee is lethargic in switching its operations to the new track. It is bogged down with petty economic questions and devotes little attention to raising the level of scientific analysis, and to working out the major problems of the future which will determine the structural and qualitative changes in the national economy of the republic.

The republic Council of Ministers must bear a significant share of the responsibility for this: it has not paid sufficient attention to the comprehensive development

of the cities and rayons, nor to satisfying the needs of the populace for goods and services, and has not fully utilized its own rights and local resources for these purposes. There are many shortcomings in the work of the Administration of Affairs at the Council of Ministers. And the chief among them is insufficiently effective control over the fulfillment of its many decrees and commissions.

The activities of the Presidium of the republic Supreme Soviet and the standing commissions of deputies also require further activation. They must operate actively in all spheres of social life, and concentrate their primary attention on solving the entire complex of problems of social development and satisfying the multifaceted needs of the workers.

Today we must speak out self-critically with respect to the activities of the Buro and Secretariat of the Central Committee under conditions of the restructuring. There have not been enough major summations on positive experiences and on the most characteristic shortcomings in the restructuring. Proper adherence to principle and perceptiveness have not always been shown in evaluating the activities of certain leading cadres, party committees, and state administrative and economic authorities. It must be stated that the members and candidate members of the central committee, and the members of the audit commission have for all practical purposes not yet spoken out with respect to the activities of the buro and certain of its members, secretaries of the central committee. Their attitude toward other republic administrators is the same. If some sort of statement or other is occasionally made, it is done very quietly, in the form of a desire. This is a chronic illness which greatly hinders all of our work, and it must be cured at all costs. And the sooner the better.

You are aware that in December, in accordance with the recommendation of the Central Committee Plenum, the report of the Buro of the CPLi Central Committee on restructuring will be read at the next CPLi Central Committee Plenum. But rather than wait until then, hopefully those speaking today will frankly express their observations to the Buro and Central Committee Secretariat. This would help us a great deal in better preparing ourselves for the approaching plenum.

We shall not restate the materials from the CPSU Central Committee Plenum today. You have all had the opportunity to familiarize yourselves with them. Being familiar with them is one thing, but it is much more difficult to put them into practice in the specific conditions in every collective, region and branch.

The restructuring of the management of the economy which was outlined at the June Central Committee Plenum is the most profound and most extensive in all the years of socialist construction. It takes in all levels—from the enterprise to the USSR Council of Ministers—and all spheres of the economic mechanism—planning,

the system of economic stimulus, and the organizational structure of management. The essence of the fundamental restructuring of management of the economy lies in the transition from predominately administrative and predominately economic methods of supervision at all levels, to management by interests and through interests—to broad democratization of management and activation of the human factor. The enterprise must become the starting point for the radical changes in the economic mechanism. The Law on the Enterprise (Association) fundamentally changes the position of the enterprise in the national economy and establishes a new place for it in planning, in material-technical supply, in financial-credit relations, and in mutual relationships with ministries and the local authorities. Most importantly—it assures their actual independence and responsibility on the basis of total profit and loss accounting. Self-support and self-financing lie at the basis of all their activities.

What must we do without delay? First of all, every production collective—be it an industrial enterprise, kolkhoz or sovkhoz—must objectively study and define a concrete program for transition to progressive management methods, to total profit and loss accounting and self-financing. At the same time an atmosphere of creativity must be provided and a realistic evaluation made of the true state of affairs—because it will be necessary to solve some very complex problems, especially in collectives with a low profit margin or those operating at a loss. In this connection it is very important to provide a systematic approach to preparation of the collective for transition to the new management conditions, and carefully examine their readiness. Persistently introducing progressive experience already accrued in this matter now comes to the forefront. There has been a great deal of propaganda and talk, but little concrete action. We must put an end to inflexibility and foot-dragging in carrying out all of the resolutions which have been adopted, and react in a businesslike manner to criticism, especially from "below."

An uncompromising struggle must be waged with everything that hinders the establishment of the new economic mechanism: formalism, command-pressure methods, and interference in the operational activity of the working collectives.

Large problems must be solved in restructuring the activities of the republic ministries and departments. Their attention must be concentrated on key economic, scientific-technical and social questions. Party committees of ministries and departments will play a larger role. They must decisively interdict any attempts by staff officials, no matter what their rank, to operate in a bureaucratic manner and to micro-manage their subordinate enterprises and organizations. They will have to wage an offensive struggle with conservatism and routine, with red tape and bureaucratism, and step up their demands on the apparatus for undeviatingly putting the resolutions of the June Plenum into practice.

The CPSU Central Committee has set the task to maintain a hard line for improving the structure and the effectiveness of the work of the managerial apparatus of republic and rayon elements: to elimination of surplus, parallel and duplicate subunits and elements. Moreover, one should not wait for additional instructions, but display initiative and commence in-depth study of these questions right away. At the same time it is very important to show proper concern for the workers released in connection with staff reductions.

The tasks for restructuring the financial mechanism, for increasing the role of the financial organs, for developing the banking system and strengthening their influence on raising the effectiveness of the economy have been defined in the resolutions of the party and government. Qualitatively new tasks have been set for the financial and banking authorities for formation of financial resources, increasing the role of credit, and improving monetary transactions. The task of the officials of these organs is to quickly restructure their own work in accordance with the new requirements.

The scale and the depth of the forthcoming transformations in the management of the economy require the proper party and political support. All the tasks proceeding from the resolutions of the June Plenum must be carried out under the constant, competent supervision and strict control of the departments of the Central Committee, the party gorkoms and raykoms, and the primary party organizations.

The new economic situation requires that all supervisory cadres and all workers thoroughly understand the essence, the novelty and the scale of the economic reform, and that they learn to operate effectively on the basis of the new economic principles. A broad field of activity is opened here for all workers on the ideological front.

It is important to explain convincingly and in depth the essence and principles of the restructuring: to show on the basis of concrete examples what is already being done, how it is being done, and what must be done to accomplish it. The people must have a thorough grasp and understanding of the urgent tasks; only thus can one count upon the proper activation of the human factor, without which no restructuring whatever is possible.

Ideological work and the activity of our press must be fundamentally renovated and activated.

All newspapers and magazines, radio and TV editorial staffs and ELTA [Lithuanian Press Agency] must constantly and skillfully depict the concrete steps of restructuring, including the restructuring of the management of the economy; they must propagandize the new and give publicity to outstanding people—innovators, and enterprising leaders—the "engineers-in-charge (prorab) of restructuring," as they are so colorfully described in the central newspapers.

It is understandable that the stream of problems and criticism in the press and on radio and TV will continue and should not slacken. But the criticism should be constructive and competent; the mistakes in which the enemies of democratization and openness immediately joined in must not be permitted.

Unfortunately, our press has of late permitted some regrettable blunders to appear, which cannot be justified as any sort of inevitable consequences of the restructuring. For example, the weekly publication *Gimtasis Krashias* actually spoke out against Soviet holidays, including the republic Song Festival. *Vecherniye Novosti* in depicting the upheaval in which the fate of a certain public garden in Vilnius was decided gave vent to excessive emotion and placed the citizens of the capital in opposition to the city authorities. Such blunders are inadmissible.

The renovation of our society brings to the forefront the further strengthening of friendship and cooperation of all the Soviet peoples, and consolidation of the principles of proletarian internationalism. This requires that all party committees, primary party, trade union and Komsomol organizations, Soviets, and leading economic cadres, pay heed to the contemporary national processes going on both in the republic and in the working collective; and to questions of strengthening patriotic and international education. The recently adopted CPSU Central Committee resolution, "On the Work of the Kazakh Republic Party Organization on International and Patriotic Education of the Workers," sharply focused attention on this.

Certain party committees, primary party organizations, and academic and labor collectives have become lax in this work. To this very day in many places, working in fits and starts, superficial and high-sounding statements are held in esteem, but there is little concrete activity. Quite often negative phenomena in the sphere of national relations are hushed up.

The CPSU Central Committee has shown us serious shortcomings in atheist education in the republic. Our work in this area has been acknowledged to be unsatisfactory. It was noted that the Buro of the CPLi Central Committee and I myself as central committee first secretary have not demonstrated the necessary responsibility and firmness in carrying out the specific commissions of the CPSU Central Committee connected with the tasks for atheist work. This is a severe but just evaluation, from which we must make the most serious conclusions for ourselves. Great personal responsibility is laid upon Central Committee Secretary Comrade L. Shepetis himself.

We must closely combine all preparations for working in the new manner with the comprehensive resolution of the economic and social tasks of the five-year plan and the plans for this year. We have already spoken of this. It

should only be stressed that in the second half of the year we are faced with tasks no less complex but more so than those we had to solve in the first six months.

We must all gear ourselves up for energetic and very intensive work.

This pertains especially to workers in the agroindustrial complex. To their credit we must acknowledge today that they have managed to overcome very complex weather conditions and break down the negative tendencies in procurement of cattle feed. But this work is far from finished: it must be continued without reduction of intensive efforts. Meanwhile the administrators of certain rayons gave in to a "crybaby" attitude and did little to prepare for sowing. This pertains to Ionavskiy, Kayshyadorskiy, Shirvintskiy, Shalchininskiy and certain other rayons.

At the same time we must also get organized for a difficult harvest season. The grains are very late in maturing and in many fields they have fallen down. All of this must be considered in the most careful manner and must be organized in such a manner that the grains be harvested without losses; winter crops must be planted on-time, autumn plowing for spring sowing must be supported, and late crops must be harvested.

We are expanding work of truly historic significance in carrying out the resolutions of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum in the year of the 70th Anniversary of the Great October Revolution. The highest responsibility is required of party organizations and all communists in assuring the success begun 70 years ago in the great cause of socialism.

There is no doubt that the communists and all the working people of Lithuania will be equal to the tasks put forth by the party; that they will successfully accomplish the restructuring and strive to accelerate the socio-economic development of the republic; and that they will carry out their patriotic and international obligations with honor.

9006

Cadre Policy Discussed at Uzbek CP CC Plenum
18300633a Tashkent KOMMUNIST UZBEKISTANA
in Russian No 6, Jun 87 (signed to press 5 May 87)
pp 18-27

[Editorial: "The Party's Cadre Policy Under Conditions of Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] In the work of the party committees as agencies of political leadership, a technocratic style based on administrative pressure resulted in serious failings, and in Uzbekistan a perversion of the principles of cadre work lead to very serious consequences—persons invested with the very greatest powers turned up among major state criminals. As emphasized at the Uzbek

Communist Party Central Committee's Fifth Plenum, every case of this sort casts a shadow on the party as a whole and on the Soviet regime.

Party organizations also need to seriously work on eliminating other consequences of the violation of Leninist principles and norms of party life. Observance of collegiality in work is of primary importance. It is known that in the recent past the role of party assemblies and elective agencies was weakened, and this deprived communists of the possibility of taking an active part in the discussion of vitally important issues and, consequently, of having a real influence on the situation in the labor collectives and society as a whole. Violations of the principle of the equality of communists also took place. Many executives proved to be outside the scope of oversight and criticism, which resulted in failures in work and serious violations of party ethics. In this connection the 27th CPSU Congress pointed out: **in the party there are not and should not be any organizations that are outside the scope of oversight and closed for the purposes of criticism; there are not and should not be any executives protected from party accountability.**

A deviation from the rule that the main thing is not the size but the quality of party ranks also affected the battle readiness of party organizations.

A negative influence on the work of various party and state agencies, labor collectives and public organizations was exerted, on the one hand, by stagnation phenomena in the cadre corps, when there was no influx of new people for decades, and on the other, by a kind of cadre leap-frog and the unjustifiably frequent replacement of executives in industry, the agrarian sector and other spheres. Conservatism, management by administrative fiat, hastiness in making decisions, pseudo-adherence to principle, and intolerance of the independent actions and thinking of subordinates are still strongly manifest even now, under conditions in which the old approaches are being broken up, and are preventing matters from being genuinely organized. Thus, it was noted at the party Central Committee's Fifth Plenum that the inertia of habit is blocking scientific and technical progress. In 1986 only 83 percent of capital investments allocated for this purpose was spent. At many enterprises questions of technical reequipment continue to be pushed to the background. The conservatism of cadres also makes itself very appreciably felt in the sphere of agricultural production. Intensive technologies are not being adopted as widely as they should be, and the improvement of mechanized harvesting is being held up.

Attention at the plenum was focused especially sharply on the problem of the development of animal husbandry, and it was pointed out that this problem is not only economic but sociopolitical in nature. Therefore, cadres should be deeply steeped in the importance of this task, resolutely restructure themselves, master present-day

methods of economic management, and vigorously work to introduce the collective and family contracts, cost accounting and the check system of recording outlays.

The agroindustrial complex as a whole now requires thoughtful and unflagging concern, for satisfaction of people's most essential requirements depends on it. Conservatism in approaching urgent problems, rejection of the new, scorn for experience gained in other regions, and formalism in organizing the training of all categories of agricultural employees are intolerable here.

In order to overcome the lag and the burden of the unfinished work and accumulated errors, purposeful efforts are needed. And it is no accident that the CPSU Central Committee's January Plenum set, as one of the most important tasks, that of enhancing accountability for assigned jobs, raising discipline, and creating an atmosphere of mutual exactingness. It is impossible to tolerate the fact that people who have failed to cope with their duties, are unobliging and undisciplined, have remained in executive positions for years. We are now going through a time that is an examination for all our cadres, for each party organization and each labor collective. It is identifying the genuine devotee of restructuring and drawing them into active work. But it will also force adherents of the old methods and those who do not want changes or are incapable of accepting the new to get out of the way.

Party organizations and their executives should have a special measure of responsibility. In order to lead society along the path of progressive transformations and be a genuine vanguard of the people, they must ceaselessly improve their work methods, strengthen their influence in all spheres of life, and implement a political approach to problems that arise, not permitting the excessively close supervision of economic management agencies and the taking over of their proper functions.

But here, too, not everything is proceeding as rapidly and smoothly as the times require. This was demonstrated by the discussions that were held this January by members and candidate members of the bureau, chiefs of departments of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee and deputy chairmen of the republic Council of Ministers with executives of the cities and rayons, enterprises, organizations and farms that had realized the greatest lag. They included 87 first secretaries of party gorkoms and raykoms, 76 chairmen of city and rayon soviet ispolkoms, and 287 executives and secretaries of the primary party organizations of industrial, construction and transport enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhoses. As it turned out, the basic reasons for nonfulfillment and shortcomings in the fulfillment of plans for economic and social development lay in weak organizational and political work on the part of party gorkoms and raykoms, primary party organizations and local soviet ispolkoms. It was noted that most of the secretaries of party committees with whom discussions were held have insufficient mastery of political methods of guidance, have not

strived for broad democracy and openness in their work, and have not worked persistently to establish exactingness and adherence to principle, an atmosphere of intolerance toward shortcomings, and the critical evaluation of what has been accomplished in each party organization.

The inertia of old approaches to business is still great. Many employees do not recognize their responsibility for the strict observance of state and plan discipline and have not been striving to overcome complacency, stereotyped economic thinking and the habit of being satisfied with average indices. There are still a good many party committees that operate in isolation from primary-level units, have relaxed their demands on cadres, fail to concern themselves with the training of a reserve, and rarely hear communists' reports.

The CPSU Central Committee's January Plenum clearly defined what restructuring is and what criteria should be followed by every party and state agency and all public organizations and executives in both their everyday and long-range activity. First of all, it should be recalled that our democratic institutions should actively and effectively influence the state of affairs in each labor collective. And the task of party organizations here consists in consistently implementing the line developed by the party and its 27th congress—a line of effectively utilizing direct democracy. Thus, a major political measure that party agencies everywhere are required to support is the endowing of general meetings and councils of labor collectives with the authority to resolve issues connected with production, social and cadre affairs. Special attention should be given to the election of the executives of enterprises, production facilities, shops, divisions, sections, livestock sections and teams, and of brigade leaders and foremen. In our republic, as in the country as a whole, this measure is finding increasingly broad adoption.

A great role in restructuring belongs to the soviets. They can do a great deal to accomplish the tasks of economic and cultural construction and activate the human factor. The path to this lies through a strengthening of democratic principles in the work of sessions, standing committees and deputies, and enhancing the effectiveness of the regular reporting of officials to soviets and of the practice of deputies' inquiries. There have been changes in the work of government agencies, but they have still not begun to operate at full force, in the spirit of the times. It was noted at the 27th CPSU Congress that there are many issues affecting the working people's fundamental interests that no one can resolve for the soviets. They are, first and foremost, problems of social policy and of the improvement of consumer services, health care, trade, the organization of the working people's leisure, the production of consumer goods, and the replenishment of food resources.

Unfortunately, as noted at the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee's Fifth Plenum, the soviets have been manifesting passivity and slowness in solving such

an acute problem as housing and many other problems that are of no small importance. For example, there have not yet been many changes in medical care for the republic's population. There are still cases of callousness and extortion on the part of hospital cadres, and the professional and moral level of health-care cadres is low. And there is no sense of genuine interest in the development of the branch's physical facilities and equipment.

The ispolkoms of oblast, city and rayon soviets have been timid in assuming responsibility for the comprehensive development of the territories under their jurisdiction. Settlement, kishlak and aul soviets have not been effectively drawn into active work. They do not endeavor to gain in-depth knowledge of the work of enterprises, institutions and farms, and they show little concern for the needs of the public, and rayon soviets and their ispolkoms have not been taking effective measures to enhance the role and prestige of these primary-level units.

All this requires that the party committees more firmly and consistently implement the party's line of enhancing the soviets' role, not permitting unwarranted interference in their affairs and, especially, the taking over of their functions. It is necessary to step up party oversight in this extremely important sector, carefully study and disseminate proven advanced methods, and encourage initiative. And there is a good deal of work here. Everything possible should be done to support the initiative of automotive workers in Togliatti concerning voluntary work at social, cultural and consumer-service facilities, the initiative of Leningrad and Chelyabinsk workers involving the setting aside of money saved through reconstruction for development of the social sphere, and the experiment of the Gorky Automotive Plant in the accelerated construction of housing. The movement, which is the child of the working people's creativity, for the collective guarantee of labor and social discipline is of great importance.

The work of other units in the political system also depends to a considerable extent on the level of party guidance. One of the main issues concerns raising the role of all elective bodies and democratization of the process of forming them. It is known that the CPSU Central Committee's January Plenum submitted a proposal for improving the soviet election system and for the more effective and realistic participation of constituents at all stages of the preelection and election campaign. This June an experiment along these lines was conducted in elections to local soviets in a number of election districts, including some in our republic, and on the whole an atmosphere that permitted each citizen to express his attitude toward the candidates and toward party and soviet agencies was established in the nomination and discussion of candidates—the better to know the public's mood and will.

The further development of openness [glasnost] continues to be an important concern of party organizations. Without it it is impossible to conceive of an improvement of the social atmosphere. As an effective form of

genuine oversight by the people as a whole, openness serves to improve work in all sectors of our construction and ensures the maximum openness [otkrytost] in the work of state and public organizations. Therefore, the party deems it necessary to create legal acts guaranteeing openness.

In order to give restructuring a universal and irreversible nature, the party Central Committee has identified key levels of party guidance on which the rates of acceleration to a large extent depend. These are primarily the party raykoms and gorkoms. Closest to the primary party organizations and labor collectives, they also have greater opportunity to influence their work and, consequently, to affect the progress of restructuring. It was pointed out at the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee's Fifth Plenum that in places where party rayon and city committees operate using the organizational and political methods proper to them, there have been fundamental changes for the better. But on the whole, as numerous facts confirm, changes in work style and methods are slowest of all to take place precisely on the rayon and city levels. Their officials' attention, as a rule, is totally absorbed with day-to-day economic-management concerns, and the questions of intraparty life, ideological work and study of the state of affairs in the primary party organizations are pushed to the background.

A very important problem is the work style of the secretaries of party committees. Many of them simply cannot give up the outmoded habit of looking over their shoulders at higher bodies. This is also the reason for the administrative and executive functions that party committees assume instead of engaging in live organizational and political work in the masses and being the generator and conduit of new ideas. And the party obkoms sometimes give them little help in improving their work style and methods.

This situation on the rayon and city level also results in retardation at the lower level—in the primary party organizations, which are the political nucleus of the labor collectives. It is precisely through them—and there are about 22,000 primary party organizations in the republic—if they will operate energetically and purposefully, that a decisive influence can be exerted on the acceleration of socioeconomic development. So far, however, many of them sometimes kowtow to negligent economic managers and fail to exercise the right that is granted them to monitor management's work. It should be specially noted that party organizations should be headed by principled, enterprising and courageous people who are not afraid to tell people the truth to their faces, take a firm stand and, when necessary, spoil relations with management in order to defend a just point of view.

It was stressed at the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee's Fifth Plenum that the first secretaries of the party gorkoms and raykoms bear personal responsibility

for the selection of economic executives and the secretaries of primary party organizations, and for the formation of businesslike and principled relations between them.

Work with women cadres in the republic also requires further improvement. The number of them on the apparatus of oblast, city and rayon party committees and among the secretaries of gorkoms and directors of sovkhozes has declined.

In addition to democratization in the resolution of cadre matters, another main area is the thorough internationalization of the party's entire cadre policy. From this standpoint, the directive of the CPSU Central Committee's January Plenum to the effect that, in order to enhance the internationalist tempering of cadres and enrich them with the experience of party and state work, it is necessary to intensify the exchange of cadres among republics and regions and among local and central agencies. The revival of this Leninist tradition, which has also been expressed in the reinforcement of Uzbekistan's party, state and economic-management agencies with tested cadres, is of tremendous importance.

Now hundreds of young and promising employees from our republic are being sent to the apparatus of central agencies, ministries and departments, to party committees in the country's large industrial centers, and also to study in the higher party schools of Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk and Novosibirsk. Internship in the country's central regions is of great importance for the improvement of the qualifications of cadres and their study of advanced forms of organizing labor and production. About 500 executives and specialists and approximately 10,000 workers in the common occupations from among persons of indigenous nationality will be sent there.

The party constantly keeps the questions of improving nationality relations in its field of vision. Our achievements on this path should not conceal existing problems here from us. Thus, it was noted at the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee's Fifth Plenum that manifestations of parochialism and tendencies toward national isolation have still not been eliminated in cadre work. Party organizations must display political vigilance and resolutely put an end to any attempts to do damage to the sacred friendship of Soviet peoples. In this matter the requirements of Leninist nationality policy must be strictly and consistently carried out, and the processes of the increasingly thorough internationalization of the country's economic and social life must be comprehensively taken into account. We are directed to do this by the decree of the CPSU Central Committee's January (1987) Plenum that points out the need to show concern for strengthening friendship and brotherhood among our country's peoples, to work resolutely to overcome negative phenomena in this sphere, to deliver an uncompromising rebuff to any

manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism, parochialism, attitudes of dependency, national restrictiveness and arrogance, and to oppose them with a consistent and firm internationalism. It also stresses that proper representation of all the country's nations and nationalities should be achieved in party, state and

economic agencies and public organizations, and that efforts should be made to make the composition of executive cadres more fully reflect the population's nationality structure.

COPYRIGHT: "Kommunist Uzbekistana", 1987 8756

Journalist on Publishing Different Views
PM231601 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
6 Sep 87 (signed to press 1 Sep 87) p 13

[Interview with SOVETSKAYA KULTURA editor-in-chief Albert Belyayev by A. Romanov: "Tolerance. Different Views Published by the Newspaper"—date, place of interview not given]

[Text] Without the ability to listen to and understand views which differ from your own, without tolerance of those with whom you disagree, without self-criticism, without the ability to admit, where necessary, your wrongness, and without the ability to work for common interests it is impossible to work out a correct stand in any serious work.

The press must also set an example in this. Andrei Romanov, MOSCOW NEWS correspondent, discusses this point with Albert Belyayev, editor-in-chief of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA.

[Romanov] If the conversation turns to different viewpoints in a newspaper, let's try, above all, to determine how much different they are in "SOVETSKAYA KULTURA." Has the paper recently published something which you, as Editor-in-Chief, disagreed with?

[Belyayev] Of course. For 6 months we have been engaged in a discussion on the unfavourable state of art criticism in this country, started by the alarming article of Prof. Chegodayev. Among various comments there were letters from the heads of two research institutes dealing with this subject. The authors tried to prove that art criticism develops dynamically and vigorously, so there's no need to worry. Although many members of the editorial board did not agree with their appraisal, we ultimately came to the conclusion that even such a viewpoint must be presented, so we published these letters.

Another example is the discussion that flared up round the interview of historian Yuri Afanasyev. Prof. Afanasyev tried to prove that the science of history needs radical restructuring; historians must renounce dogmatic schemes, depersonalization of history, and time-serving interpretations of its entire stages. After publishing the interview we received many letters from readers who supported Afanasyev. Some of them have been published. But the editors received letters from F. Vaganov and A. Ponomaryov, both Doctors of Science (History), who resolutely rejected the expressed viewpoint. Though I don't share their "peppy" mood and disagree with them when they say with confidence that there were no stagnation phenomena in the science of history, that there is nothing for historians to reconsider, we published this letter, too.

[Romanov] By the way, about the interview with Afanasyev. Were F. Vaganov and A. Ponomaryov the only people who argued with him?

[Belyayev] Two more historians brought enraged comments to the editorial office. We were going to publish them, too, but in no time at all the authors took their articles back. Only recently in the readers' mail we found another pair of similar letters. We published these, too.

[Romanov] Doesn't the comparison of opposing viewpoints confuse the readers? Isn't it better to try to assess in one article various viewpoints and then explain what is true and what is false?

[Belyayev] Indeed, some readers ask in bewilderment: "Why bother with these complications and comparison of views? Just tell us the correct way to understand various problems." It is our fault that we have to read such letters—we accustomed the readers to an oversimplified approach. Today they are being made to realize the necessity of independent thinking, of making the right choice themselves from different opinions. Only in that way shall we be able finally to get rid of one-sided thinking, to learn to appraise things correctly on our own.

Incidentally, we had two articles on this subject: "Personal View" by the poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko and "Personal Dignity" by prose writer Ruslan Kireyev. Both personal view and personal dignity, said the articles, contribute to broader development of democracy, to the elaboration of democratic forms of life and tolerance, as Lenin said, to people with different approaches. But here we have to overcome a host of old stereotypes, to get rid of the custom of seeing an enemy in everyone who thinks differently than generally accepted.

Sometimes a person who starts a discussion in our country does not care much about looking for truth. He is in a hurry to express his personal, subjectivist appraisals of phenomena and views as if they are of general importance, without worrying about proper argumentation. Suspicion shown towards different appraisals and views, towards people who are trying to build in a new way their relations with life, bringing them into line with the tasks of the revolutionary restructuring of our entire society, this suspicion, I repeat, is strange, to say the least.

In this case any fruitfulness of discussions is out of the question.

Newspapers and magazines now carry more debatable materials. But due consideration is still lacking. So far we have succeeded more in presenting viewpoints which recently were barred. But sometimes we do them disservice by creating "hot-house conditions," guarding from a clash with criticism. We must enable readers also to listen to the objections of opponents. The readers themselves will make a conclusion from such a clash of viewpoints. They will also look for the truth and find it. The first 1987 issue of the NOVYY MIR magazine

published an article about diverting rivers with a profound critical analysis of this project. Six months later the magazine returns to this subject, this time enabling the defenders of this project to express their views. This is, naturally, a step forward in the democratization of the process of discussion.

[Romanov] Readers write to you whatever they want. You select and publish their articles, so we have different views. Do you provide your staff with an opportunity to publish their controversial opinions?

[Belyayev] Yes, we do. Here is a fresh example. Two of our staff published a polemical article about the Moscow Young Spectators Theatre where the situation became complicated with the coming of a new chief director. A group of actors sent a letter to us, criticizing the position of the authors. We published this letter and provided the authors of the polemical article with an opportunity to answer it. The problems discussed in the debate that broke out were important, in our opinion, not only for this theatre. We hope that the actors of other children's theatres and, perhaps, not only children's, will join in the discussion. In fact, the point at issue is the restructuring of theatrical work. It is essential to compare various viewpoints on this process.

[Romanov] Are there views which you will never publish?

[Belyayev] We, naturally, shall not publish materials directed at discrediting the socialist way of development, the heroic history of the Soviet Union, our Revolution, the Soviet people's profound feeling of internationalism, lofty aims and tasks of perestroika. Certainly, we shall not publish war propaganda or articles whipping up hatred among nations, pornography. There is nothing to discuss on this point.

[Romanov] Can you give some examples when discussions in your paper were of practical use?

[Belyayev] Certainly, the meaning of newspaper discussions is not only to help form "3-D" thinking, an ability to look at the problem from different angles. This very ability must help find an exact solution of the problem. And it helps, indeed. Take the situation with the founding of the Union of Theatrical Workers. Initially it was thought to set up an All-Union Theatrical Society, after the pattern of the All-Russian Society. We published the draft rules, worked out by the USSR Ministry of Culture. A heated discussion started. The question was: is it necessary to expand the All-Russian Theatrical Society to an All-Union level or set up something basically different? Among other things we published a letter

signed by Mikhail Ulyanov, Kirill Lavrov, Georgiy Tostonogov, Mikhail Shatrov and other well-known theatrical workers. In it the idea of setting up the USSR Union of Theatrical Workers was substantiated. The Ministry of Culture invited the authors of this letter and suggested that they revise the rules taking into consideration their views. As a result, a creative union was formed and was provided with an opportunity to become an equal partner of the Ministry of Culture on guidance of the creative process in theatres.

[Romanov] Perhaps, the paper sometimes has to express such viewpoints which are not to the liking of the people who recently could not be criticized. Don't they exert "pressure" on you in that case?

[Belyayev] This sometimes happens. For example, in the column "Direct Speech" we published an article by the Voronezh writer V. Semyonov about the bureaucratic methods of guidance of literature and art by some people from the cultural department of the regional party committee. The article is sharp and with ample proof. Telephone calls were made from Voronezh, to the effect that the published article was written not by the proper author. Complaints on the paper were also sent to other addresses. The local paper published an article criticizing the author. The question was submitted to the bureau of the regional CPSU Committee. The paper's deputy Editor-in-Chief participated in the session. The discussion was frank and principled. The bureau recognized the article in the paper as timely and correct. The reply of the regional committee was also published in our paper.

[Romanov] A few years ago it seemed to many people that great diversity of views in the press will cause harm to society. Now we see that there is nothing to fear. But what will happen in several years' time? [Belyayev] Now we are going through a peculiar school of instruction. We are learning glasnost, and tolerance of different views. We are all learning. Right up to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, as Mikhail Gorbachev said. This is because we are all the children of a certain period. And each of us has to get rid of a great deal in order to attain new levels of political thinking. I think that the movement along the road of glasnost and democracy will inevitably lead to SOVETSKAYA KULTURA publishing more and more views not only of cultural workers but also of those who create this culture, the views of readers, spectators and audiences. The problems will be discussed, reflecting the actual diversity of views, and discussions will proceed in a spirit of respect for other opinions. There must be no pretence, no passing over in silence. We shall learn to speak about problems in a constructive and businesslike manner, to make each our article contribute to the strengthening of the positions of socialism. We must be able, and we shall learn, to face any truth.

Traditional Interpretations of Stalin Era Defended
18000756a Moscow VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS in
Russian No 5, May 87 pp 110-122

[Article by V. A. Kozlov, candidate of historical sciences:
"The Historian and Restructuring"]

[Text] Soviet society is taking the path of restructuring. We have already crossed a boundary, beyond which a simplified understanding of past experience, ready-made maxims and prescriptions, attempts to act "by carbon copy", guided by a "model" of socialism which has been "ossified" at the level of the 1930's and 1940's, have been shown to be entirely inadequate. There are processes gathering force that are leading us further and further into the area of creating something new. Today, it depends upon the historians themselves what kind of role their science will play in solving the pressing social problems which have been set forth by the April 1985 Central Committee Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress: whether it will only record events or will basically enrich social practice through timely interpretation of historical experience. Whether it will satisfy the modern man's need to understand his past and present, or whether he will turn for historical knowledge and explanations to literary and current affairs writing. Will the historian succeed in bringing to the broad readership an understanding of specific historic laws, of social development, or will he remain only a purveyor, albeit of bright, illustrative factual material.

Meanwhile, historians of the party and of Soviet society find themselves in a complicated situation. Academic councils and editorial offices are already returning, though still shyly, books which even yesterday were unquestionably "passable". Historical journals have begun to show a taste for polemical and critical materials. The mass information media are constantly publishing letters from readers, which contain sharp, burning questions, to which one will not always find an answer, even in special historical research works, to say nothing about text books: the question of the criteria of timeliness and effectiveness of historical research has become acute. At the same time, books and articles continue to come out, which can be identified as belonging to our times only on the basis of their date of publication and their modernized terminology. Historians are somewhat perplexed. Some simply have ended up in the same situation as the naked "emperor in his new clothes," although, like their storied colleague, they also often do not notice this.

Serious difficulties are being experienced not only by advocates of "quotation methodology", of commentator style [kommentatorstvo] and commonplaces, and of repeated reference footnotes, but also of those researchers who really want to see serious changes in our understanding of the past. Having obtained an opportunity to directly and openly express themselves regarding burning historical problems, they have felt a heavy burden of personal responsibility for what they had wanted to but

did not say yesterday and for what they can and must say today. Indeed, the avoidance of the difficulties of mastering materials, analysis, and presenting conclusions can no longer be covered by a saving reference to "sapient minnows" [note: a literary illusion to the faint-hearted who attempt to avoid conflict, particularly with authority] and by the claim that "they wouldn't let them talk about this, anyway." And at the same time there is a stormy public discussion of the problems of our ancient and recent past. Writers and journalists, party-members and non-party-members, historians and non-historians, and people of different generations and life experiences are rushing to express their views on questions which, for a long time, historical science avoided in silence. The historians themselves are undergoing a unique period of manifestos and declarations that have splashed out of the auditoriums and academic council halls into the pages of popular publications. (Footnote 1)

History must be written in a new way, it must be purged of distortions, of silent treatment, and of commentator style — such is the critical spirit of the appeals that have been sounded.

Work necessary and useful to our science is in progress.

Following the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the country entered a new phase of restructuring: analysis of the situation became deeper and more precise, a program of further activities was developed, and now we need to carry it out by daily, painstaking, plain hard work. Historical science, including party history, is still lagging behind the general pace of progress. Critical analysis of the situation, which has developed in our field of social science, still seems far from perfect. We still sometimes wait for directions and instructions; we hope that they will define the "limits of the permissible" for us. The author of the present notes reaches this judgement not only on the basis of himself and of his colleagues at work. Solid confirmation of this complicated psychological situation, of those difficulties which historians, particularly teachers, have run into, can be seen, in particular, in a letter from Docent A. N. Davydov, which was called to my attention at the editorial offices of the journal "Voprosy Istorii KPSS". "It is known," it says in the letter, "that recently, in the pages of the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, there appeared a series of articles pertaining to questions of the study of CPSU history (see No. 2, No. 3, No. 6). In No. 2 of this year, they published an article by Professor Yu. Afanasyev, 'The Energy of Historical Knowledge' (Footnote 2). In No. 6, in an article by Yegor Yakovlev, it is said that Professor Afanasyev in no way represents the truth in the final instance. A conflict of views is in progress. But, in the article by Professor Afanasyev, a number of questions are raised, concerning which I would like to read, to hear your opinion, as the organ of the CPSU Central Committee's Institute of Marxism-Leninism. Indeed, we have to work with our students. 1. In Comrade Afanasyev's article, it is said that textbooks sometimes present a far from accurate Stalinist picture

of the victory of the October Revolution and the building of socialism in the USSR; 2. It is said in the article that the unfortunate student is being bombarded by a barrage of Stalinist definitions — the "variety of Menshevism", the "Menshevik deviation", the "anti-Revolutionary group", the "agency of the kulaks", and the like, which the student must spend most of his intellectual powers learning by heart. At the same time, he is being deprived of the possibility of coming to understand the essence of the theoretical arguments and concepts of socialism, of comparing the path of building socialism in the USSR with the path of socialist construction in other countries, etc.

The question arises whether the portrayal of socialist construction that is given in our party literature should be called purely Stalinist.

Can the definitions of certain (listed above) deviations and opportunistic groups which existed within the ranks of our party be called purely Stalinist definitions? Indeed, these definitions are given in materials from Central Committee plenums and party congresses. For example.... Excerpts from party documents follow

I well understand the difficulties which A. N. Davydov and other teachers of party history have encountered. In very many auditoriums today, people are voicing — publicly and loudly — questions which only very recently students were asking *tete-a-tete*, in private conversations, and only of those teachers whom they absolutely trusted. Possibly, in doing so, some students are making reference to Yu. Afanasyev. But have such questions really not confronted other historians? Indeed, in essence, they are a result of hush-up, of simplification, and of sketchiness in interpreting the history of the party.

The article by Yu. Afanasyev and the letter from A. N. Davydov stand in polemical opposition to one another. However, we will assume an attitude of respect toward both viewpoints, guided by the wise rule: "They say that, between two opposing views, there lies the truth. In no way! Between them lies a problem..." (Footnote No 3) So, wherein lies the problem in this case?

Indeed, not in the way of speech to which the evaluative formulations, about which A. N. Davydov asks, individually belong (although, in certain of them, in my view, one senses that personal impatience of I. V. Stalin, about which V. I. Lenin once wrote) (Footnote 4). And even more so, not in an agreement with the mistaken views of particular persons active in opposition groups and deviations. The problem, in my view, does not lie in "whether the portrayal of the victory of the October Revolution and of the building of socialism, given in our party literature, can be called purely Stalinist". It may be that any sort of "portrayal", even one convenient for dialectical purposes and for study, will no longer satisfy the intellectual requirements of society. The need today

is for a different level of proof and persuasiveness, for overcoming the old ailments of our textbooks, and particularly also of special historical research — sketchiness and simplification in interpretation of the most urgent problems of the history of the party and of Soviet society.

This requirement for depth and breadth of historical perception is being sensed everywhere today. "Half-truth," as G. Kapralov correctly writes in his review of the television film series "Strokes to a Portrait of V.I. Lenin", "which always stands alongside the lie, and the portrayal as some sort of stupid 'whipping boys' of those who entered into polemics with Lenin, who took other positions, who went over to the enemy camp, have caused our art a great deal of ideological and artistic harm. And, is there any way that such 'examples' could be used to seriously teach the skills and courage of revolutionary struggle, to inculcate true Leninist conviction". (Footnote 5)

A general assessment of the state of affairs in the study and teaching of social sciences has already been given by the party. As M. S. Gorbachev emphasized at an all-union conference of social science faculty heads, "the presently existing organization and forms and the methods of teaching the social sciences are contributing in large degree to what we call dogmatism and scholasticism. An inclination to look for 'prescribed truths', for prescriptions suitable to all the events of life, is born from scholastic thinking, from counting not on the creative work of thought, but on the mindless rote-learning of general propositions.

"Lenin, as is known, contrasted deep consideration to memorization, to cramming. And it is precisely this that is frequently inadequate in teaching the social sciences." (Footnote 6)

Accordingly, the answer lies in independent consideration. Nobody is going to resolve our professional questions for us, the historians. And mutual accusations and raised tones, applications to higher levels for "clarifications", much less attempts to turn polemical lashings into political mistakes, will hardly be of help. Indeed, we are all united in believing that history must be written and taught in a new way. For the time being, nobody has ready prescriptions how to do this. But it would be profound self-delusion to reduce our new tasks to a very simple arithmetic activity — to an elementary replacement of pluses for minuses (or vice versa) in assessing the past.

When we ask ourselves the question of why historiography has been so easily blown by the "winds of circumstance" (an expression by K. Simonov — Footnote 7), of why, after the "submersion" in the recent past which began at the end of the 1950's and the beginning of the 1960's, we have so easily fallen prisoner to commentator style, to hush-ups, and to simplification, then we first of all see the reasons for this outside the limits of historical

science itself. To a certain degree, this is justified. In analyzing past experience, historians have been prompted to show the "good and the useful", moreover in such a way as not to touch upon the processes behind transformation of yesterday's "good" into today's "bad". For many years, such a situation narrowed the field of vision of historians, orienting them toward a "balanced" story concerning "the good" (first of all) and "the bad" (as a last resort). This was a result of that "lack of self-criticism" which, as the Soviet philosopher E. V. Ilyenkov once wrote, "is expressed in the fact that present time is presented without the contradictions which comprise the mainspring of further development." And, with such an abstract, complacent "self-consciousness", all preceding development begins to be portrayed as a process of approximation to a certain ideal maximum condition, such as this present time imagines itself to be. As a result, any image of the past is illuminated only in those abstract outlines which can be presented as "hints" or "germs" of the state of things today. Everything else begins to seem to "immaterial", and those specific historical contradictions, which both gave birth to and destroyed the stage that has been passed, fall precisely into this "immaterial" category." (Footnote 8)

Such an approach does not agree well with the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism. It has left an unfavorable mark on the entire historiography of Soviet society, which itself has directly experienced the consequences of a "contradiction-free" conception of the development of socialism. And if today we see in life not "individual shortcomings", mentioned for decency's sake in addition to our unquestionable achievements, but a sea of problems which both explain and give birth to our achievements and shortcomings, then it would be strange not to see the very same thing in the past. Thus the general course of restructuring and the sharply critical spirit of our crucial times are creating possibilities for critical interpretation of our "yesterdays".

All this certainly does not mean that no methodological reefs and or theoretical shoals lie waiting in our new path. History is actively participating in the arguments and discussions of the present day. And here tendencies sometimes arise to mechanically transfer today's ideas to the past, to attempt to evaluate it as an "inferior present". (Footnote 9) This concerns, in particular, a striving on the part of certain publicists to transfer today's perceptions and understanding of cost accounting, our attitudes toward administrative methods, and the like, to an evaluation of the decisions and practice of a period that has passed. Willingly or unwillingly, with such an approach, the events of the past are evaluated not from the point of view of its real contradictions, problems and possibilities, but from positions which agree or do not agree with our today's knowledge, preferences and priorities, and sometimes simply with the personal viewpoint of one or another publicist.

An article by L. Voskresenskiy, "On the Path to a Socialist Market", intended to explain to the reader our

interest today in Lenin's concept of the New Economic Policy (NEP), to a certain extent affords an example of such a pragmatic attitude toward history. The appearance of the article, without doubt, is a response to the pressing problems of the times, but the treatment of its theme cannot but raise objections. L. Voskresenskiy gives an extremely negative evaluation of the policy of "war communism". In his opinion, the destruction of the country's productive forces at the beginning of the 1920's was a result not only of prolonged war, but also "in no less measure, of the incompetent and voluntarist practices of the 'left' extremists, who were trying 'to nationalize' everything down to the last needle and thread." A like evaluation — but this time in rosy colors — is given to the practice of the New Economic Policy. To illustrate his point of view (along with absolutely correct ideas concerning the saving role which the NEP played in restoring the country's ruined economy), the author resorts to a prose rendition of the poem "Fine!" by V. Mayakovskiy: Spring 1927: — Windows thrown open, the stores stand. In the windows, there are products: wines, fruits. The cheeses are not fly-specked(!) The lamps shine. 'Prices Reduced'. — The factories are puffing: there will be more cotton cloth. Cooperation has begun to fledge. — To the peasant from early morning 'work is pleasure!': He 'Ploughs for a while, then writes poetry'." (Footnote 10)

Against the background of such a contradiction-free picture of the NEP, in which no place can be found either for class struggle, or for analysis of the serious disproportions of the national economy, or for study of the administrative "props" provided by economic levers, the change in the methods of economic policy at the beginning of the first five-year plan is seen in the same negative light: it is presented as a result of bureaucratic arbitrariness and L. Voskresenskiy sees no objective reasons, no categorical imperative for shifting the center of balance to administrative methods.

While they hold different views concerning the NEP management mechanism, historical specialists — unanimously, it seems to me — cannot accept the "model" of "war communism" and of the NEP proposed by L. Voskresenskiy. And the reasons for this are not in the paradoxical nature and novelty of the concept he proposes, but in its obvious lack of agreement with generally known facts.

In a publication intended for historians, it is hardly necessary to talk about this in any kind of detail although, we emphasize, these questions certainly do not fall in the category of those that have been "finally solved" in historical science. (Footnote 11) And, nonetheless, to evaluate L. Voskresenskiy's ideas about "war communism", it is worthwhile presenting the opinion of a person who not only did not sympathize with "war communism" but with communism in general: "Having run into a shortage of almost all consumer goods, resulting in part from the strains of wartime — Russia had already been fighting without interruption for 6 years —

, in part from a general breakdown in the social structure, and in part from the blockade, monetary circulation in total disarray, the bolsheviks found a natural way of rescuing the urban population from the grips of speculation and from death by starvation and, in the desperate struggle for the food and vitally necessary products which remained, introduced a system of rationed distribution of products and of unique collective control.

The Soviet government introduced this system in keeping with its own principles, but any government in Russia would have been forced to resort to this now. If the war in the West had dragged on until now, products, clothing and housing would have been distributed in accordance with cards and orders". (Footnote 12) Thus wrote G. Wells, who visited the Soviet Union at the height of "war communism", in the autumn of 1920.

Made necessary by the extraordinary circumstances of the civil war, the policy of "war communism" in fact gave rise to a number of illusions and utopian ideas, even within the ranks of our party, and provoked unfounded hopes: that, on a wave of revolutionary enthusiasm, a direct transition could be made to socialism. But pointing to "the voluntarist practices of 'left' extremists, who were trying to 'nationalize' everything down to the last needle and thread" is hardly capable of introducing clarity into the understanding of such a complex socio-economic, political and psychological phenomenon as was "war communism". If the communists had not done what they did, having concentrated the country's resources (and the necessity for this was understood not only by the working class, but by the peasants as well), there would have been no victory in the civil war and, consequently, no New Economic Policy.

Now, one more observation by a contemporary: "We were suddenly caught by surprise by an unexpected event. The endless imperialist provocations against Soviet representations abroad and mass discussion by the bloc of bourgeois countries of a possible war against the USSR caused a panic among a part of the citizens. An indiscriminate buying up of flour and sugar began. The kulaks and some of the middle peasants began to keep bread produced for the market for themselves and not to put it up for sale." (Footnote 13) What time does this observation concern? The same 1927. Events began to play havoc a little while after that spring idyll which L. Voskresenskiy has described. And already in December 1927, at the 15th All-Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) Congress, the admission was heard that the country had suffered "the economic difficulties of the eve of war without there having been a war." (Footnote 14)

Under conditions of beginning industrialization and an increasingly tense international situation, the NEP economic mechanism began to be a hinderance. The situation leading up to the turning-point of 1929 produced a need to force industrialization, to concentrate on a small number of priority tasks (Footnote 15), to cover in 10 years the distance which other countries had covered in

a century; it demanded violation of "normal" proportions of economic development and, consequently, also a shift in the center of balance from economic levers to administrative ones. It was impossible to ensure an unprecedented redistribution of funds to heavy industry by any other means.

And the threat of war, which made this necessary to do while also rejecting the normal order of events, was accepted by contemporaries as being entirely real and close. And this was not only a matter a conflict within the KVZhD [expansion not given], which had discerned serious problems in the state of the country's military preparedness. In 1929, A. Gaydar wrote in the newspaper VOLNA (Arkhangelsk): "That year and day when the tense silence along the 1000 versts of our western border will be broken by the first salvos of enemy batteries ... this year and day and hour are still not marked in black on any of the world's calendars. But this year will be, this day will arise, and this hour will come." (Footnote 16)

The increasingly tense situation (and this was precisely how many contemporaries perceived the situation) dictated a necessity to reject a number of already developed methods which were good in themselves but which were not suitable for the new conditions. It may be incidentally noted that Lenin and the party had earlier foreseen such a necessity. In a resolution of the 10th Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) Congress, announcing the shift to the NEP, it was clearly stated that "the party must possess sufficient elasticity in order, in case of necessity, to quickly shift over to a system of military commands." (Footnote 17) The same attitude toward a "system of military commands" is contained in a letter from V.I. Lenin to the Central Committee Politburo concerning the theses of Ye. A. Preobrazhenskiy (16 March 1922): "9. The second phrase, 2nd paragraph (against "Kombed methods") (komitet bednosti — committee of poor peasants) is dangerous and untrue, as war, for example, may force a need for kombed methods." Thus, Lenin posed in dialectic terms the question of the selection of methods for solving economic problems in dependence upon the specific circumstances. In fact, any serious change in the domestic or foreign political situation probably would have changed the proportions and correlation of methods: administrative and economic, compulsion and conviction, enthusiasm and personal interest.

I am disturbed most of all not by the imprecisions which L. Voskresenskiy has permitted, but by the fact that this was done for good purposes, for the support of ideas, some of which deserve to be taken very seriously. This places me in a psychologically complicated situation. And it makes it necessary first of all to bring a pragmatic attitude toward the past into the polemic, to "drive" it frontally toward current events. And our publicists, no worse than I, know to what sad consequences this path leads. You cannot command the past; it recognizes only one form of mutual relationships — it is necessary to take account of it and it is necessary to correctly understand it, no matter whether we like it or not.

Serious historical analysis of the economic mechanism of the 1920's can provide modern practice much more than a simple reminder of the unquestionably true advantages of economic accountability (*khozraschet*). The fact is that historical experience shows both the limitations of trust economic accountability (such accountability was shallow; it failed to reach not only the individual working place, but even the enterprise, whose profits were depersonalized within the single balance of the trust) (Footnote 19), and the weaknesses of the system of material incentives for the worker, which was in effect at that time within state industry. In a word, objective historical analysis is in a position to show the possible "submerged rocks" of economic accountability as well as the ways to avoid these "submerged rocks". But, L. Voskresenskiy, distracted by ideas of a socialist market, does not even recall specifically what kind of market it was that state industry was dealing with in the 1920's. And, indeed, this was an element of small-scale production, which daily gave rise to capitalism. The experience of interrelationships with such a market certainly can have no basic significance for us today.

Idealized perceptions of the NEP can, of course, serve as an emotional argument in a debate, but they cannot lead to a correct evaluation of the real state of affairs. I will explain what I mean. Leninist ideas of economic accountability and personal incentives were much broader than the actual practice of the NEP, and it is for this reason that they have acquired such timeliness in our own days. The NEP was a specific historical form for realizing Leninist ideas, which was designed for the solution of the problems of a transitional period, for creation of the prerequisites and the "footways" for a transition to socialism. Under today's conditions, we are talking about a fundamentally different form, not that of NEP, for the specific historical realization of the concepts of economic accountability and personal incentive (the NEP form, as is known, was designed for a multi-structured economy), about a qualitatively new approach, about a new concept of progress, which is distinguished both from the practice of the NEP and from the experience of forced socialist construction in the years of the first five-year plans.

Returning to the question which unexpectedly led us to a discussion of the NEP, of the 1929 turning-point, and, more correctly, of the necessity of observing the principles of historical method in evaluating the past, I would like to emphasize that not only "external conditions", but also the insufficient professional discipline, including the methodological discipline, of some scholars has permitted them, in the recent past, to change with ease the assessments they have made. And this means that these assessments are not a product of deep consideration of historical facts on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist dialectic, but that they have simply put and glued together a montage of these facts, which has been made to fit a view of socialism that is frozen at the level of the 1930's and 1940's and that has penetrated the body and soul of historical research, texts, and popular

works and has become fixed in people's consciousness. A whole generation of historians, to which the author of these present notes also belongs, grew up in this "school". Some of us still perceive the truth to be a golden mean between fault-finding and glossing-over. But the truth in fact lies on an entirely different intellectual plane, and the civic party role of the historian in no way consists of an ability to deliver a balanced serving of shortcomings and successes, of difficulty and achievement.

The problem is not simply that study of the past is impossible without analysis of its mistakes and miscalculations. This would seem to be axiomatic for anyone with common sense. But it is naive to think that such analysis is, generally, an easy matter, that its effectiveness is determined only by the good will of the historian, only by a categorical imperative to speak the truth. Truth in history presupposes the solution of extremely serious professional questions; it cannot be reduced to pointing out guilty persons and to emotional philippics. The historian has no right to substitute moralizing for explanation, or emotion for knowledge. All these things are completely obvious. But is sufficiently serious thought being given to this, and what, properly speaking, a "mistake" is as applied to the past, in order to understand the whole importance of the problem? Is it that which people at the time recognized as a mistake (or, in principle, could have recognized)? Or that, the wrongness of which has become clear today? And in this latter case, will our progress along the path of understanding not be accompanied by an endless discovery of more and more new mistakes in the past? By attaching today's knowledge and understanding to an evaluation of the decisions and actions of our historical predecessors, we are inclined at times to view these decisions as mistaken. Meanwhile, the criterion here must be a different one — to what extent was the political leadership, within the limits of the ideas and notions of its own times, of the level of social consciousness and its possibilities and means, able to find an optimal solution? To what extent were the mistakes and miscalculations, and also what today we accept as having been mistakes and miscalculations, a result and expression of their own time, to what extent are they justified (or not justified) by the real possibilities of the era?

From this point of view, we are faced today not simply by a need for new assessments, but first of all by a transition to a qualitatively different level of professional and popular historical thinking, one which is not only protected from the "winds of fortune" by favorable external conditions for the development of science, but is also methodologically protected from them.

What kind of situation has developed today in the historiography of the CPSU and Soviet society, if we evaluate it in its most general form? We have at hand the culmination of that stage in the development of historical science which began at the end of the 1950's and the start of the 1960's with the posing of a whole series of

new problems, which continued with the stormy discussions of the 1960's and (already under conditions of a reduced general tone of creative thought and a flourishing of ostentation and glorification) ended with the preparation of a whole series of generalizing works. A part of them has already been published, another part is in the printing process, and a third is in full swing. In due course, the mere prospect of the appearance of these fundamental generalizations determined the themes of a large number of local research projects, and these studies themselves, with all their accomplishments and shortcomings, naturally, determined the level of subsequent generalizations.

It is difficult to imagine that, during coming decades, Soviet historical science will be engaged only in filling in these factual lacunae which have appeared in the course of work on generalizing works. As applied to our science, this would be a truly extensive path of development, perhaps also a calm one, but one with low effectiveness. Something else is also difficult to imagine: that, 20 or 30 years from now, generalizing works on the history of the party and Soviet society as a whole, on the working class, on the peasants, and on culture, will simply repeat the outlines and approaches that have been worked out for present-day multi-volume editions, that, to use the words of the philosopher, in "reproduction of the whole", we have reached a certain kind of methodological ceiling.

Thus, the new stage in the development of society objectively coincides with a new stage in the study of its history. It is to be supposed that the greatest successes of this new period will be related to an effort to individualize historical creativity. Collective works, with their unavoidable companion, the depersonalization of research which sometimes brings dozens of scholars together under the same roof, are good for presenting results and for generalizing what has been achieved. But when a need arises to renew the cognitive framework of historical knowledge, the success of this is determined from the outset by compact collectives of like-thinkers and by separate creative individuals, and here monographs become the predominant form of research.

In the historiography of the CPSU and the USSR we are dealing today with what is called in scientific practice a "problem situation": The repeatedly cultivated field of traditional themes and problems is becoming exhausted and we are increasingly looking toward virgin lands in historiography; old approaches are growing ineffective and torturous birth is being given to new ones. Unavoidably, in such situations, researchers find themselves confronted by the particularly urgent questions of what to do and how to do it? Whether to continue, so to say, the extensive accumulation of factual data in order to illustrate already known conclusions or, on the other hand, whether to continue to follow an intensive path, to ask themselves those questions to which there still are no clear and final answers?

Traditional historical generalizations have frequently been structured according to the following plan: a researcher has uncovered (sometimes simply recounted) the content of particular fundamental political decisions and then, using specific materials, has shown the activity of the CPSU and the Soviet government in carrying them out (at the start of the period, prerequisites were created and problems posed; at the end of the period, the problems have been basically solved). With such an approach, which was entirely satisfactory to many historians until the recent past, the development of Soviet society was portrayed as a progression to some sort of "contradiction-free essence". The contradictions in the development of a socialist society, this "mainspring", this source of "self-propulsion", were compressed, as it were, into the "junctions" between periods. The question of how, in discussions and sharp clashes of opinion, problems themselves are formulated, which reflect the real contradictions of life, and how they are solved, producing not simply "forward movement", but new contradictions — all this, if it did not end up outside the framework of historical research, was, in any case, given light treatment. What can such history teach? First of all...industriousness, that, if a problem has been posed it must, of course, be solved. But, in this way, one cannot learn to think independently, cannot learn the dialectic, and cannot understand the laws which govern the historical movement of society and his own place in this movement.

Methodological errors in interpreting the history of the party and of Soviet society (and these are particularly evident in textbook literature) lead to serious educational losses. This is most evident of all with regard to that mosaic picture of the 1930's which exists in the mind of modern man: the striking enthusiasm of the first five-year plans and the crude violations of socialist legality; the growth of a feeling of personal worth in millions of people and the cult of a single man; the fierce opposition to an active, real and effective class enemy and the "enemies of the people," in whose ranks many honest and dedicated communists and non-party members perished. All this was. It is necessary to know and to remember about all this. But it is just as incorrect to attempt to judge the 1930's by the laws of modern life, separating out the sharpness of the class struggle during a period of transition and the special characteristics of building socialism in one country, as it is to use the "severity of the times" as a full justification of all mistakes, excesses, and violations of legality.

Mistakes do not cancel out successes, but, at the same time, successes do not justify mistakes — this truth is sufficiently clear. However, a paradox lies in the fact that the "white" and the "black" parts of the total picture of the 1930's exist, as it were, independently of one another, that one part of this picture is drawn with the benefit of scientific and popular scientific historical research, while the other is based on information which derives from other sources and that has not been "worked over" by professional history. And, as a result, in ordinary,

everyday discussions about the distant and difficult prewar times, a simplified metaphysical logic sometimes prevails: simple justification or condemnation of the past. In the everyday "working" model of the 1930's which is used by modern man, either the "positive" or the "negative" predominates, but the dialectic is usually missing. As a result, perception of the epoch as a whole is destroyed.

It is very difficult to explain this phenomenon. I will make only one preliminary observation. At one time, at the end of the 1950's and the beginning of the 1960's, in the course of open and publicized discussion of the problem, the "cult of personality" was frequently referred to within historical science as a universal explanation for all the problems and difficulties of the prewar period. At the same time, the concept itself was given a very broad interpretation. Initial "absorption" with this problem was, in fact, then curtailed until the end of the 1960's. The theme of the personality cult was, in essence, removed from analysis of the pre-war five-year plans and was placed in special "reserved areas" — one or two pages in text books and generalizing works dedicated to a retelling of the well-known CPSU Central Committee resolution. Not infrequently the justification was that enough had already been said concerning this question. The vacuum that was created began quickly to be filled by "oral tradition", by commonplace, far from scientific explanations. In the study and interpretation of the dramatic pre-war period of Soviet history, our science must "restore its reputation" and it is necessary to do this on a modern methodological level, avoiding one-sided assessments and judgments.

Unfortunately, I am unable to find within modern historiography any convincing examples to illustrate this theme. But I think that we do have a worthy literary model: A. Bek's novel "A New Assignment" provided an objective picture of the communist manager at the end of the 1930's and the beginning of the 1940's — of a "soldier of the party", a "fighter to fulfill directives". As the writer was justified in believing, history had not earlier seen any people like Aleksandr Leontyevich Onisimov: "The epoch gave them their stamp, inculcated in them the first duty of a soldier — to carry out orders! The rule of the regular soldier became their device, their 'creed': the order, and no discussions." (Footnote 20) Onisimov hates the ways of the nobleman, idle evenings at home are intolerable to him, he knows only one thing — work. But at the same time, guided by the authoritative rule "if you trust, you perish", by impatience with opinions "from below" and by "independence" on the part of subordinates, he is accustomed to "maintain the apparatus at a high level of tension". Onisimov, in A. Bek's words, "did not even know about ideas concerning paradoxes, about the contradictions of the era. He distanced himself from questions which might trouble him, a communist, his reason and conscience, escaping by the most simple of means: it is not my business, it does not concern me, it is not for me to judge. His favorite brother

died in prison: in his soul he mourned Vanya, but even then he remained firm in his "Don't make judgments!". (Footnote 21)

These people are "inscribed" into the era; in their intellectual world, they reflect its contradictions, difficulties, and mistakes. It is very easy to pronounce verdicts condemning or justifying them. Indeed, Onisimov, his comrades, and his colleagues had to live in their own severe, difficult and heroic times, about which we have been given only safe and speculative knowledge. Managers of Onisimov's type were tightly "bound" to their own era: their work style was calculated for the solution of a narrow group of problems under the extreme conditions of building socialism in one country. Outside the limits of this situation, their management methods degenerate into bureaucracy, administrative excess, and the suppression of initiatives from below.

Historians, in my view, still have to do what the writer has done by means of the literary word. It is true that, at times, historians have already set themselves to the solution of this problem, for example, in preparing the 9th volume of the "History of the USSR from Ancient Times to Our Day" (the first paste-up of the edition has been preserved). And now, among historians, one can hear talk about the need for special studies regarding the history of the personality cult. Such a viewpoint, certainly, has a right to exist. But nevertheless, in my view, the foreshortened examination of prewar and postwar history, proposed by some historians, hides in itself a danger of serious squabbling. With such an approach, there is a risk of turning an epoch of socialist construction, of heroism, of victories in the struggle of the Soviet people into an "epoch of the personality cult". But, indeed, there is a real public need today to create a truly scientific political biography of I. V. Stalin and of other leaders, particularly N.S. Khrushchev.

In my view, there are costs in the treatment of a number of the most pressing problems of the history of the party and Soviet society, which are directly related to the fact that the question of the specific historical contradictions of socialist society has, to a large degree, dropped out of the sphere of historical analysis. As a result, historical thought has frequently recorded mainly the "visible layer" of changes that have occurred, often lapsing into a descriptive and commentary role, focussing on showing the "outside" of a process and, as it were, not paying attention to its deep bases. The latter, in this case, has become the prerogative of philosophers and sociologists who, according to widespread opinion, have been supposed to "generalize" the facts collected by historical science. It is as if the unified process of progressing from the abstract to the specific has been divided by departmental barriers, while the place of theoretical concreteness has been unjustly occupied by empirical concreteness. Herein, I think, lies the main internal reason for the surprising susceptibility of historical science to the "conjunctive arbitrariness" [konyunkturiy proizvol] for which they have so often and justly chastised us in recent times.

Insufficient specific historical support for theoretical ideas concerning the complicated dialectic of the development of Soviet society has also contributed importantly to fixing a frozen "model" of socialism in the public mind and to the spread of harmful illusions: that it is sufficient to reach a "good decision" in order to solve all problems once and for all. In essence, such illusions are a necessary attribute of the obsolete kind of thinking, which has been the target of many justified and harsh words in recent party decisions. This old type of thinking has emerged, in particular, as a striving to find "cure-all solutions" and as a certainty that these will be highly effective. Meanwhile, with culmination of the transitional period, the practice of "one-time" actions, aimed at solution of the question "who whom?" and the elimination of one of the combatting contradictions, should have given up its place to the practice of seeking solutions of a fundamentally different type. The non-antagonistic contradictions of a socialist society presuppose not the elimination of one of the contradictions, but their conscious combination. (Footnote 22) The need to foresee only the closest "final" result of one's activities gives way before a necessity to foresee a new form of contradiction and on this basis to "combine" contradictions, that is, to make use of them for further movement.

The chief problem, of course, does not lie in the declaration of this sufficiently obvious principle, but in translating general theoretical positions into the language of concrete history. In this connection, it is not new facts per se that are expected from the historians, but new thoughts and ideas, not recitations but judgments. Factual material is the basis of any historical research, but only the basis, a foundation upon which a building of historical generalizations is built. We have too often known the final result of our research (research, and not popular science work) in advance, and it has remained only for us to support this conclusion with facts. Perhaps we have been able to confirm already known truth in this way, but we could not discover new truth.

Great cognitive possibilities and prospects for basic intensification of historical analysis are opened, it seems to me, by a trend in historical science which we can conditionally call the analysis of alternative situations. (Footnote 23) This question is too important to be treated fleetingly in these notes. I will say only that, in my view, historical research which is built on the principles of this approach is capable of taking on qualitatively new features and of fundamentally changing traditional forms that, in many ways already, are out of touch with the questions by our contemporaries. A concentration of work that is being done around the critical points of social development, examination of history from the standpoint of the dialectic of the possible and the real, theoretical and concrete historical support for the invariance of the historical process, revelation of the potential possibilities of past activity and, in the final account, this means also of present-day possibilities — all this is capable of raising historical knowledge to a new level in terms of evidence and of

persuasiveness, of increasing the contribution of historians to development of the methodological bases for and the practice of scientifically managing society. In this case we are talking not about a process of speculating "what would be, if...", as is sometimes so characteristic of ordinary arguments, but about the discovery, using concrete historical materials, of the real dialectic of objective conditions and of the subjective factor in the turning points of social development.

The search for approaches to "alternative situations" is not the only methodological prospect. In the last monograph by I. I. Mints, "The Year 1918", we are also dealing with very promising methodological devices which are aimed not only at providing a well-founded system for the consistent recounting of events, a but also at the development of means to subordinate this recounting to revelation of the fundamental contradiction (contradictions) of the period under study, of "the keys to the moment", and on this basis to give a picture of it as a whole and not a mosaic. Generally speaking, the main direction of methodological developments, it seems to me, is being relegated today to those same "junctions" between periods where, according to the traditional formula for generalizing work on the history of Soviet society, figuratively speaking, the contradictions have been "hidden". At the same time, there is an increase in the significance of historical psychological research, of analysis of the "human factor" of history and of the specific historical laws pertaining to coordination of the expedient activity of people under conditions of building and perfecting socialism.

On these bases, not only the study of history, but also its teaching can be transformed into a permanent and absorbing search for the truth. I can imagine "methodological games" in student auditoriums, when study, for example, of the position of the right deviation or of the "left communists" during the Brest period will not take the path of learning prepared formulas and evaluations by heart, but will be structured around collective critical analysis of a proposed alternative route. I am convinced that such study of the history the party and of Soviet society will afford the young person such graphic political lessons and will teach contemporary and independent thinking in such a way that it (this study) will become one of the most popular study subjects. This will be true living history, capable of convincing, and not just edifying, of teaching one of the chief qualities necessary to our contemporary man — to take no word on faith, to speak no word against the truth.

Taking a measure of the future and contemplating the present, modern man is looking more and more intensely into the mirror of the past. The task of the historian does not lie in polishing this mirror to a shine or in blowing the dust specks, the "mixed litter" of past life off it; the main thing is that it is neither cloudy nor distorting.

Footnotes

(1) See Yu. Afanasyev, "The Energy of Historical Knowledge", MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, 11 Jan 87 pp 8-9;

By the same author, "From Positions of Truth and Realism", SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 21 Mar 87; I. Mints, "A Weapon No Less Sharp", OGONEK, 1987 No 1; A. Samsonov, "To Know and Remember", ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, 1987 No 10, pp 1-2, and others.

(2) The author of the letter has in mind an address presented by Professor Yu. N. Afanasyev at the Moscow State Historical Archives Institute - ed.

(3) I. V. Gete, "Selected Essays on Natural Science", Moscow 1957, p 393

(4) See V. I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works", vol 45, p 346

(5) PRAVDA, 26 Jan 87

(6) KOMMUNIST, 1986, No 15, p 5

(7) See "4th Congress of USSR Writers, 22-27 May 1967, Stenographic Report", Moscow 1968, p 160

(8) E.V. Ilyenkov, "Dialectical Logic. Essays on History and Theory", 2nd ed., supplemented, Moscow, 1984, pp 256-257

(9) There is, it is true, another, opposed, but equally mistaken tendency, which was pointed out by I.P. Prusanov. See VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, 1987 No 2, p 78

(10) L. Voskresenskiy, "'On the Path to a Socialist Market", MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, 30 Nov 86, p 12

(11) See, for example, the recent discussion between Ye. G. Gimelson and I. B. Berkhin, VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, 1986 Nos 6 and 10

(12) G. Wells, "Russia on the Brain", Moscow 1958, p 14

(13) A. G. Zverev, "Notes of a Minister", Moscow 1973, p 95

(14) "15th Congress of the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), December 1927, Stenographic Report in 2 Volumes", vol 2, Moscow 1962, p 1094

(15) See A.S. Tsipko, "Certain Philosophical Aspects of the Theory of Socialism", Moscow 1983, pp 200-201

(16) Quoted from T. Gaydar, "Arkadiy Golikov from Arzamas", NOVIY MIR, 1986 No 7, p 151

(17) "The CPSU in the Resolutions and Decisions of its Congresses and the Conferences and Plenums of its Central Committee", vol 2, 9th ed., supplemented and corrected, Moscow 1983, p 327

(18) V. I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works", vol 45, p 44

(19) See Z.K. Zvezdin and S. V. Kulchitskiy, "Problems of Industrialization Within the System of the Economic Policies of the Transition Period", in the book "The Economic Policies of the Soviet State in the Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism", Moscow 1986, p 88

(20) ZNAMYA, 1986 No 10, p 42

(21) Ibid., p 29

(22) See V. I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works", vol 42, p 211

(23) See, for example, P. V. Volobuyev, "On the Problem of Selecting Paths of Social Development", VOPROSY FILOSOFII, 1984 Nos 1 and 2; I. D. Kovalchenko, "The Possible and the Actual and Problems of Alternatives in Historical Development", ISTORIYA SSSR, 1986 no 4 13032

Artist Glazunov Deplores Resurgent Avant-Garde
PM021411 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 87
Second Edition p 3

[Article by USSR People's Artist I. Glazunov under the "Publicist's Comments" rubric: "Quest Via Tradition"]

[Text] Restructuring for an artist primarily means the opportunity to express his position. To do so honestly, boldly, and objectively. And I recall Chaadayev's words to the effect that an artist may be very wise but he will be no true artist unless he is privy to the secret of his time. What is that secret? In my opinion, it is above all the real disposition of the forces of good and evil.

My work expresses my creative position. For 30 years I have always wanted to reflect the truth and what the people feel. And high realism has been my ideal. Both an abstract concern with form, on the one hand, and photographic naturalism, on the other, are alien to me.

I am often asked what the essence of restructuring is in the fine arts. Everyone wants real changes here too. Questions are put by various people... I think that restructuring means not total license for a "wild outburst of democracy" or freedom "from" but freedom to gain deep insight into the fate of the motherland, Russia, and the people, the fate of art, our past, present, and future.

The period of stagnation did considerable harm. And today we are aware of an erosion and sapping of the fundamental principles of our national [otechestvennyy] art, a move away from a clear apprehension of the struggle between good and evil, a move away from art as thinking in images.

Where are artistic discoveries equal to the times we live in? Why are there so few canvases imbued with innovation? Why at exhibitions from Kuznetskiy Bridge to Krymskiy Bridge are there so few vivid works that show understanding of the historic paths traveled by our people and of our past and present reality.

Why does the trend of returning to the embrace of the twenties and plunging into the waves of the avant-garde and abstract self-expression having little in common with actual reality cause disquiet? Can you really describe a store-bought mirror beneath which the author writes the title "Portrait of a Contemporary" or a blank canvas with the inscription "I Was in a Bad Mood and Could Do Nothing" as artistic innovation? I think these "works" essentially show up the artists for what they are and are an admission by them of their artistic bankruptcy. Nevertheless, such "works" were on show at a recent exhibition.

There is no doubt in my mind that an artist who has not received formal artistic training is always a dilettante, and a dilettante is always a "modernist" sheltering behind diverse "ism's." Losing touch with the real world, he loses his purpose, idea, and direction. While

simultaneously claiming the title of artist of a modern "elite" art. Some young people, in the quest for innovation and in pursuit of a fashion established by someone somewhere, have rushed toward pseudodiscoveries, sheltering behind long familiar forms. The desire to express the truth of life leads dilettantes to the photographic reproduction of it, nowadays known as hyperrealism. They sometimes shift from abstract solutions to "naive" art. But is a naive interlocutor really interesting to us? The essence of art, as is well known, lies in the answer to the questions "what" and "how."

The revival of the avant-garde today is a blind alley. I think that in the last 70 years the avant-garde has long been seen by many of us as an *arriere-garde*. It is now part of history. It took gigantic efforts by Repin's pupil, Isaak Brodskiy, to revive the foundations of the Russian realist school.

It is now primarily important that we preserve tradition. It is necessary to carefully nurture the school of national art, which along with the European schools, has given the world brilliant artists who are diverse in their creative aspirations and vision. Tradition alone, in my view, permits a productive, creative quest and the creation of works in tune with the spirit of the times.

It is good, of course, that the doors of art galleries and exhibition halls and even parks and streets are open for all who wish to show their art. It sometimes happens, however, that some home-grown "discoverers," complaining about the still recent spirit of interdiction and basking in the aura of former "persecution," stand before the public like emperors with no clothes. Cheap imitation, withdrawal from life, attempts to shock, and undermining of the traditions of Russian and European art are typical of works by these "genuises." Their work is nevertheless admired.

Much in the assessment of artistic life today depends on the press and criticism. And it is incontrovertible that that the most important element in these evaluations and analysis is good will rather than score-settling. Quite recently, in the guise of combating the arrogant aims of one grouping or one clan, the predilections and subjectivist assessments of another grouping were imposed. Cliquishness must not be identified with competitiveness, free creative competition. Cliquishness is lethal and harmful to our culture, it slows down and kills the establishment in the creative milieu of a feeling of respect for the extraordinariness of the creative individual, for talent, and for people who may err in some respects but are sincere, honest, and uphold a position of their own. The more diversity, discussion, searching for ways to reflect the truth of life, and commitment to solving our society's problems there is, the more effective contemporary art is.

Let us now recall the forgotten first congress of Russian artists in 1914. Let us pick out just two names—Repin and Kandinsky—from among those who expressed, as

we understand it, fundamentally opposed views on art at the congress. It is good that the congress was distinguished by the profound way in which questions were raised, its willingness for discussion, and sincere concern for Russian art.

How poor it is that some of our critics today are totally incapable of giving up their monopoly of long-established and musty evaluations, attaching labels on all sides or crowning particular artists with dubious laurel wreaths.

I am convinced that elite art does not exist. Nor is there any art for the masses; there is high art intelligible to all. For whom, for example—for an elite, for the crowd, or for the people—did Surikov, Ivanov, Vrubel, Fedotov, and Nesterov paint?

I am worried about the fate of young artists, the fate of the national school of painting. The development of art, new artistic discoveries, and loyalty to tradition are impossible without a high level of professionalism and a national school. A school alone is capable of continuing tradition, and to maintain traditions is to maintain the future of Soviet and Russian art. As Surikov brilliantly observed, because he so loved the composition of the old masters, he began to see it everywhere in life.

Tradition represents the roots. To fight tradition is to fight culture. I think that we rob young artists—our future—when we neglect to remind them of national self-awareness via schooling and education in the supreme sense of that term. In our contacts with pupils we professional artists see how they sense the discrepancy between word and deed. They sense that when in the portrait class at the Surikov Art Institute which I run with the artist P. Litvinskiy we speak about a high level of skill, a school, and traditions that something else—the propagation of home-grown avant-gardism, leftist tendencies, in short, dubious amateurishness—is at the center of attention, at the center of the polemics and discussions on problems of art. Things reach the point where continuity of tradition is rejected and it is argued that each new generation discovers its own laws in art for itself alone. But I am convinced that such "personal" laws do not and cannot exist.

The sign of the times and the sign of changes must be that artists occupying a firm realistic stance should have every right and opportunity to counter via the press, public speeches, and television the opinions of the advocates of total license in painting. Only creative contest, open discussion of works involving the opinion of broad strata of society, and glasnost in everything that affects the evaluation of an artistic work can ensure progress and serve as a source for profound creative aspirations.

Many things are troubling today. For example, the closure for lengthy repairs, lasting years, of the Tretyakov Gallery, the Russian and Historical Museums, and the Manezh. Is it conceivable that the music of Mozart

and Rakhmaninov might instantly cease to be heard? But this is precisely what has occurred in painting: There is virtually no access now to the immortal works of Aleksandr Ivanov, Repin, Rokotov, Rublev, and Surikov. Why? What is to be done? A whole generation of people is being deprived of contact with great art merely because various departments, cultural and construction departments, are unable to agree on one thing—how to complete the building of new galleries and museums as quickly as possible. And is it really impossible to find premises for the temporary exhibition of world-famous treasures belonging to all mankind?

Another problem is the enormous shortage of specialists. Where is the school of restorers? The few dozen specialists our educational institutions train today cannot really do much. Money is not being spent and quite a few architectural masterpieces—our memory and our pride—are falling into decay. Fortunately, the party and state put much effort and resources into preserving our treasures and history. This is exemplified by the rebirth of war-ravaged Pavlovsk, Gatchina, and Pushkin from ruins and ashes. And Leningrad itself too.

Our capital is a different matter. Moscow, as is well known, has lost many world-famous architectural monuments in recent decades. On leafing through monographs and books on the history of Russian art and reading memoirs and accounts by foreigners we become aware of the riches that have been lost. We are also made aware of how necessary it is to protect our heritage.

It is distressing to have to say that the propagation of knowledge about our historical and cultural heritage is at quite a dismal level. The All-Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments, of which I was a founder, works in a sluggish and unenterprising way, with little participation by young people.

It is good that recent congresses of the Union of Architects and Union of Artists of Russia, which I have often attended as a guest, have raised the very acute problems of preserving historical and cultural monuments.

It is very good that the CPSU Central Committee Politburo recently approved the USSR Council of Ministers Resolution "On the Comprehensive Reconstruction and Development of the Historic Center of Moscow." An important place is assigned here to the reconstruction and restoration of historical and cultural monuments and the expansion of museum and exhibition space.

I would like to conclude by saying that there are rumors circulating both here and abroad that I am a founder and leader of the "Pamyat" society. The French journalist France Nouvelles [as published; apparent allusion to French magazine FRANCE NOUVELLES—FBIS] and others have written about this, for example.

I am surprised that the French journalist did not find time to come and talk to me. He would have found out that I always have been and remain a Russian, a Soviet citizen, patriot, and internationalist. I have no connection with "Pamyat."

Many good people—patriots, representatives of the Soviet people—belong to "Pamyat." And it is deplorable, I think, that adventurers and chauvinists sometimes attach themselves to these healthy forces in our

society. Internationalism is the consummation of national cultures. I am in favor of patriotism and real service to the cause of preserving the people's memory, above all, the cause of devoted labor for the good of our multinational fatherland. It is essential to affirm what is positive.

I believe in restructuring and a bright future for our great people.

USSR Aide on Pollution Status of Moscow Atmosphere

PM031611 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 26 Sep 87 Second Edition

[Ye. Smirnova, I. Smirnova interview with V.G. Sokolovskiy, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control, under the heading "Whether the Capital Can Breathe Easily" and the rubric "Topical Interview"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] V.G. Sokolovskiy, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control, talks about problems and tasks connected with protecting our capital's atmosphere.

[Correspondents] Valentin Georgiyevich, what is the state of the atmosphere in Moscow at present?

[Sokolovskiy] If we compare Moscow with other cities in the country, the level of pollution in the capital's atmosphere generally corresponds to the average. Although there are "excesses" at times. What is the reason for this? On those rare days when there is absolutely no wind, the warm layer of air above the city prevents motor vehicle exhaust fumes and industrial waste from dispersing and leaving the capital. It is on days like this that the maximum concentration of carbon monoxide and nitric oxide on Sadovoye Koltso is sometimes almost 9 times over the norm. But on normal days the carbon monoxide level in Moscow's green belt is within the norm, as a rule, although in residential areas it is 1.2 times above the norm on average and 1.5 times above the norm in the industrial zone.

Nevertheless, Moscow's atmosphere is quite good. The air is purer and there is more greenery, as foreign guests have remarked.

[Correspondents] Nevertheless, the editorial board often receives letters from readers concerned at the state of the atmosphere in their area. People complain about enterprises operating without any purifying units. And if they do have filters, they either do not work or are often simply ineffectual.

[Sokolovskiy] It is indeed true that in some parts of Moscow there is increased atmospheric pollution by ammonia, phenols, and hydrocarbons. This is particularly true of the city's Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon (Orekhovo-borisovo). We have the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy's Moscow Coke Gas Plant and the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry's Moscow Petroleum Refining Plant to thank for this. The question of closing down these enterprises, as well as a number of others responsible for considerable air pollution, has been raised.

It would be sensible to orient these production units toward retooling with a view to using low-waste technology.

[Correspondents] Motor transport also makes its own "contribution" to atmospheric pollution. Will we ever see exhaust "traps" on vehicles?

[Sokolovskiy] We have been thinking about this for some time. Especially as 69 percent of Moscow's atmospheric pollution is caused by motor vehicle transport.

In almost half of 5,000 vehicles tested, the toxicity of their exhaust fumes was found to be above the norm. The Moscow Regional Inspectorate has prohibited the use of these vehicles until the matter is rectified and the City Automobile Inspection has fined the offenders.

The concentration of fumes in the air can also be reduced by using waste-gas neutralizers which reduce harmful fumes by a factor of 5-6. Unfortunately, the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry has not yet organized the mass production of these neutralizers. What is more, the use of non-ethylated petrol "permitted" by our standards produces a fair amount of lead in the atmosphere.

[Correspondents] In just over 10 years we will enter the new, 21st century. We would like to know what the future holds for us.

[Sokolovskiy] Unfortunately, I have no comfort to offer at present. Work is moving extremely slowly, and in the last 5-year period the air in Moscow became only 5 percent purer. So there are sufficient grounds for concern. Sometimes, in their concern to fulfill the plan, the managers of industrial enterprises clean forget about people. The end result is colossal waste. I am talking about financial resources. As far as the moral aspect is concerned, the conclusions are obvious.

Oppressed, Tradition-Bound Tajik Women Driven to Suicide

18300634a Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 87 p 4

[Article by staff correspondent A. Ganelin: "Under the Yashmak: Cruel and Monstrous Customs Have Been Covered up for a Long Time"]

[Text] Tajik SSR—I am looking at a file named "Cases," on the cover of which are dates of birth and death. Of young girls, older girls and young women. Various given names and surnames. And they have one thing in common—the brief line, "committed suicide by self-immolation." The father of one of them would not allow the girl to go to school, and she couldn't stand it. The relatives of another, with whom she lived, tried to give her in marriage against her will. A third was beaten by her husband and mocked by his family; seeing no way out, she—

"Three years ago there were 30 cases of self-immolation in the republic," I was told in Tajikistan's Ministry of Internal Affairs, "and last year there were 40."

From information in the duty unit of the republic Ministry of Internal Affairs:

January 1987. M. Vakhidov, born 1940, a tractor driver, locked up his daughter, a housewife born 1965, in a metal cage specially made out of concrete reinforcement rods; he held her there from 10:00 pm on 2 January until 6:00 pm on 3 January. The dimensions of the cage were such that a person could only crawl in it and could not straighten out or stand up fully.

"What it amounts to is that the father sentenced the daughter to one day of imprisonment," noted a militia officer.

And how many cases not just of one-day but of lifetime imprisonment in which girls languish have never reached the militia. It is not a matter of a metal cage with iron bars. It is a matter of a cage whose bars are stronger than iron—made of old customs and "traditions" and religious prohibitions. In it, too, it is impossible to straighten oneself up. Impossible to stand up to the full height of human dignity.

Going outdoors without a veil is a disgrace. Going to the cinema is not allowed. Being seen with a boy is a disgrace. Disobeying your elders is not allowed. Going off to study is a disgrace. Marrying against the will of your parents is also a disgrace. And for disobedience, you get shut in. For leaving home—locked up. Matters are carried to the point that girls, mostly from rural areas, leave life forever. Lacking the strength to break those bars, they protest against the constraining framework of

life in which they have been imprisoned, and they leave it through self-immolation. Almost all cases of self-immolation by girls occur at home when members of their families are there.

"It is very difficult to prove that a person has been driven to suicide," investigators complain. "It's a family, domestic matter, with no witnesses."

Yet there are witnesses, and they are numerous: those who saw that girls were not being allowed to go to school, that bride money was being paid for them. More precisely, perhaps, not witnesses but sideline observers. Detached observers. The most diverse people with whom I tried to talk about this subject agreed: "Yes, you still encounter such gloomy cases in the context of the feudal-landowner vestiges of the past," and they would tactfully avoid a "flammable" discussion. Most likely they consider the subject of self-immolation to be a purely "domestic" one for the republic and the discussion of it to be suicidal either for their careers or for tranquil family life.

For too long nothing but showcase figures concerning successes and achievements were heard everywhere. And they invariably included figures about how many Tajik women had received a higher education, become delegates and deputies, and been promoted to executive positions. Every year there were more of them. But how many during this same time did not receive, did not become and were not promoted? This is simply something that no one knows. How many girls and young women died? From year to year, their number has not been declining.

Some figures were open to everyone, like the gates of the exhibition of our achievements. They were included in a victorious column in all reports and compilations of information. Others—how many died—passed mournfully and unnoticed through militia reports: these figures were called closed. That was very convenient: by classifying the whole "zone of woe"—self-immolation, drug abuse and a great deal else—as secret, like a military installation, to create a picture of all-encompassing, absolute well-being. And thereby to classify as "secret" the people who responsible for it, placing them beyond the supervision of the people.

And if people at one end of our vast country are noisily debating the issue of whether girls are losing their femininity from engaging in judo, at the other a "hidden" fight has been, and is, under way to allow them to go to school and marry for love. The score in this fight is kept not in points but in lives. It is long past time to cry out about this at the top of our lungs. But it is as though the topic has been under a yashmak.

Have different times arrived?

"Tell me," I asked at the republic Girls' Council, "not just about those who have become prize winners, deputies and delegates, but also about those who have died this year alone."

But for M. Shadyeva, chairman of the council and a secretary of the Tajik SSR Komsomol Central Committee, and Z. Akbarova, head of the republic Komsomol Central Committee's sector for work with young women, it was as though these figures were still "secret." They simply did not know them, just as they did not know the fact that, as it turns out, in the republic procurator's office there is a certain M. Gafurzhanova, procurator for the investigative administration, who deals with the problem of self-immolation. On the other hand, they gladly told about what they knew well: about how the rayon Girls' Councils were combating vestiges, about the Tajikistan Komsomol Central Committee's comprehensive "Young Family" program, about how women who cast off the yashmak during the Soviet regime's first years are traveling together with lecturers from the Knowledge Society to make speeches, and about how efforts are presently being made to step up the sending of Tajik girls to vocational-technical schools in Russia. And so that their parents will let them go more willingly, a decision has been made to send their teachers together with them. Yes, a good deal is being done. For example, last year alone 6,000 people went to study in vocational-technical schools in other republics, while only 9,000 were sent during the entire previous five-year period. The persistence and consistency of the Komsomol Central Committee in this very complicated but very necessary work deserves good words. Especially since girls from rural areas are not allowed to go to school even in their own republic capital, let alone other republics. Last year B. Nasrullayeva, first secretary of the Komsomolabad Komsomol Raykom, had to transport girls who wanted to enter institutes to Dushanbe in secret from their parents. "We helped them, like everyone who comes to us with a complaint," we were told at the republic Girls' Council. But how many do not come, because they would have to return to their former life with the solid locks of prohibitions?

I went to several mosques. Three mullahs with Korans in their hands proved to me that Islam forbids suicide.

"I recently saw one esteemed person criticizing us on television," one of the three said, smiling into his young beard. "But when his sister died, he still called on me. Or take weddings. We're also called, on the sly, to theirs, the Komsomol ones."

And just as people call mullahs to weddings, they also pay bride money on the sly.

"It is not necessary to see bride money as necessarily entailing the buying and selling of girls," I was told, and it was explained to me that for parents a daughter's wedding is the pride and joy of their whole life. Therefore, according to tradition a bountiful feast is held,

guests are given gifts, and dozens of dresses given by the bridegroom are hung in the yard. All the money, sheep and items brought by the bridegroom go for the feast and gifts for the guests. And the parents of brides do not make anything on the bride money. The payment they receive is purely symbolic. Such is the folk custom. And who can be against a folk custom?

Not only girls who, through self-immolation, avoid the lot of being given in marriage in exchange for bride-money, but many young men also oppose such "folk" customs. For example, those who sent a letter to the editors from Kurgan-Tyube about how hard it is to save up 13,000-15,000 for a wedding. This is also the source of "hostile relations" between the parents of the husband and the young bride. And then, is it possible to consider "symbolic" the payment of 7,200 rubles that Kh. Chalokov, for example, received for giving his daughter in marriage? At the Gissarskiy [Rayon] Procurator's Office I encountered in one criminal case a complete list of what the parents of the bride had demanded from the bridegroom. It would take a long time to cite the whole list—the same as listing the assortment of goods that are hard to find in the department store. Here are just a few "prime necessities" that the bride's parents received: 1,800 rubles in money, two cows, two sheep, six meters of polyester fabric, 12 meters of satin, three meters of lace, 30 pairs of galoshes, 40 robes, kilograms of tea, honey and dried fruits, and a great deal else.

A. Kasymova, chairman of the republic Women's Council, told how during a meeting at a Dushanbe higher school the students asked where they could buy the rare fabrics that brides' parents demanded.

We hastened to declare that we had fully liberated the woman of the East, who had cast off the yashmak, and that we had achieved women's equality, and built developed, mature socialism. Which means we had also cast all "women's" problems from the locomotive of history. Only isolated shortcomings remained: in Tajikistan—feudal-landowner vestiges that we were still just getting over, and in other regions—the birthmarks of capitalism. But where does a tractor driver born in 1940 get feudal-landowner vestiges? From his fellow kolkhoz members of the same age? After all, they never saw a living feudal landowner face to face! No, of course, the easiest thing of all is to explain self-immolations as merely the result of hostile relations based on feudal-landowner vestiges of the past. That means the whole responsibility lies with the past. But on what grounds have vestiges of the past flourished so luxuriantly in the present?

One of the lowest per capita levels of hospitals, schools and cultural and preschool institutions exists in Tajikistan, while the whole country lags behind in this respect. The country's highest birth rate is in Tajikistan. The country's highest rate of child mortality is here, too.

Of 234,000 people not employed in social production, 94 percent are women, it was noted at the republic party plenum. More than 30,000 members of the Komsomol do not work in social production and are not in school. Most of them are girls and young women. The problem of job placement in the republic also involves mainly the feminine gender. Women in the villages are simply not trained for work in social production, only for marriage. And they sit home until their weddings, restricted by the tight frame of old customs and traditions. And even after their weddings, when they have large families, they are all the more restricted. Many Komsomol raykoms complain that those who have quit without removing their names from the rolls are mainly girls who have married. After marriage they completely withdraw from public life. Only personal auxiliary farming, which for many is their principal place of employment, their personal large family, and a complete loss of individuality. Without education, training in a specialty or the possibility of getting a job, they depend completely first on their parents, and then on their husband and his parents, who receive them as personal property that has cost them the many thousands they have spent on the wedding.

So far, the division of labor on the republic's cotton fields is the following: brigade leaders and weighers are mainly only men. Pickers are mainly only women. Moreover, they pick cotton by hand. When I talked with S. Bazarova, the present deputy chairman of the Azerbaydzhan Kolkhoz and former member of the Komsomol Central Committee, who was one of the first in her Kuybyshevskiy Rayon to take the controls of a cotton-harvesting machine, she recalled that there used to be a widely developed movement of girl farm machinery operators in the republic. But now in many rayons they are very reluctantly entrusted with machinery.

At how many atmospheres does one measure the constant pressure under which girls and women find themselves and work and at home, living in a divided world? On the one hand, they have heard talk about atheism, and those who have engaged in these conversations have secretly followed the mullah. They have seen beautiful buildings and streets on television, but even in their rayon center they have not seen a normal hospital. They have read in newspapers and books about how young men and women work and study together, but in their own village they have not been able to openly look at a boy they like, get a job, or go to school. And the difference between the atmosphere in which they have lived and the one that has been officially talked about, written about and shown has led to a situation in which a single spark, a single word, has been enough to set the fire ablaze.

Yes, in the period of stagnant phenomena there were mistakes, we readily confess now. And there is seemingly no one to hold accountable for bringing matters to such a state. And the procurator's office does not concern itself with such mistakes. It's simply that some people did not prepare themselves for the increase in the republic's population, did not build hospitals and schools, and village branches of factories and plants, where women could work, on time. Others "closed" all problems, in general, since they were not supposed to exist under socialism. Still others were disturbed by only one problem—fulfill the cotton plan at any price. Today we measure the mistakes that were made in percentages, tons and rubles. And in lives. That thought hurts more than a burn.

8756

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

24 Nov 1987